

NATIVE-AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY: EXPANDING SOCIAL PARTICIPATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION

By Mindy L. Berry

Mindy L. Berry, M.P.P., is a senior consultant with The Alford Group, a consulting firm that offers strategic organizational and fund development advice to the nonprofit sector. Prior to the Alford Group, she headed her own firm, Berry & Associates, which provided consulting and project management services to the Council on Foundations, large and small foundations, educational institutions and think tanks. Before consulting, Ms. Berry served in two federal government posts in the Bush administration—first as an intergovernmental affairs officer in the Office of the Secretary of Labor, and then as a senior intergovernmental affairs liaison and senior policy analyst in the Office of the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts. She has more than a decade of experience in the nonprofit sector, including management, research, development, teaching and board services in such organizations as Independent Sector, Georgetown University, the Washington Child Development Council, USA Today All-American Academic Awards (High School, College and Teacher), Duke University-Washington Program and the Supreme Court of the United States, as well as other public and private sector organizations. Ms. Berry has received several awards and holds a master's degree in public policy, with a concentration in economics (M.P.P.) from Georgetown University. She has also carried out academic work at the London School of Economics and Political Science.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary _____	31
Native-American Philanthropy: Expanding Social Participation and Self-Determination ____	35
Philanthropic Potential of Native-American Communities _____	36
Historical Context of Philanthropy in Native-American Communities _____	38
Cultural Underpinning of Native-American Philanthropy _____	43
Native-American Donor Models _____	50
Analysis of Giving Vehicles _____	54
Types of Charitable Funds _____	62
Charitable Giving through Indian Tribal Activities _____	70
Emerging Forms of Native-American Charitable Giving _____	78
Endowment Building among Native-American Communities and Organizations _____	78
Fundraising Strategies and Messages in Native-American Communities _____	81
Conclusions _____	85
Recommendations _____	87
Endnotes _____	90
Methodology and Information Sources _____	100
Organizations and Tribes Contributing to this Project _____	102
Acknowledgments _____	105

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Across the United States, Native communities are demonstrating rising interest in, and use of, creative ways to give with greater effectiveness and durability. Within each community, institutionalized giving is guided by the customs and traditions of the particular indigenous culture. Along with the cultural influences to giving, history also has played a significant role in the Native-American experience, ability, and interest in institutionalized philanthropy.

Native communities have always practiced various forms of giving, from rituals and religious ceremonies to auctions and art fairs. For some tribes, however, recent economic successes have resulted in increased philanthropic activity. Forms of giving have evolved from informal to more institutional activities through tribal foundations or tribal governmental activities to nonprofit organizations, and more recently, to individual philanthropy. Institutional philanthropy, as defined in Euro-American terms, i.e., private foundations and public charities, reflects only part of the circle of giving in Native communities; receiving gifts completes the circle. Along this continuum, some tribes have extended gifts of commercial or political value, or both, while others pursue more community or locally oriented projects. Whatever the cause, for most Native communities, it is not new to share and exchange; it is new to institutionalize and standardize these activities.

Examples of how Native communities are using the techniques of institutional philanthropy include:

- Formation of partnerships with other Native and non-Native entities as a means of achieving self-sufficiency and self-determination as well as leveraging human and financial resources; and
- Establishment of tribal foundations, incorporated under tribal law, as a way for Native people to protect their sovereignty and independence and contribute to tribal services and infrastructure needs.

Some tribes have also expressed interest in the development of tribal community foundations as a way for their members to participate in community development and quality of life enhancements (health, environment, housing, etc.)

Endowments are also gaining popularity in Native communities. Notwithstanding the volatilities in the economic and political conditions, an increasing number of Native donors and

nonprofits are considering the long-term potential of endowed reserves. Native nonprofits, however, confront obstacles in building infrastructure and in managing and sustaining endowments. Native donors, in turn, are reluctant to contribute to permanent endowments without building confidence and trust in the long-term institutional possibilities of the organization.

Native communities are undergoing rapid changes—some more quickly than others. With these changes comes new opportunities for greater self-determination, social participation and cultural preservation. Institutional philanthropy may be one channel to attain or sustain independence. To enhance institutional philanthropy in Native communities, programs must be designed to:

- Expand understanding of the various forms of Native-American philanthropic lifeways;
- Promote increased Native-American philanthropy; and
- Build the capacity of Native-American nonprofits to stimulate giving.

EXPANDING UNDERSTANDING OF NATIVE-AMERICAN PHILANTHROPIC LIFEWAYS

More extensive research would be useful to explore the patterns, styles and motivations for giving, fundraising and endowment building in particular segments of the Native-American community. Such research might include:

- A broader and more focused quantitative examination of tribes with gaming enterprises, Alaska Natives and Native Hawai'ian charitable and volunteer activities;
- A concentrated study of giving among individual donors in Native-American communities and the impact of new wealth in some communities—reservation- and nonreservation-based;
- An examination of investment and financial strategies used by tribes and Native organizations for charitable purposes;
- An exploratory review of remittances to tribal kin, clan or organizations; and
- A concentrated review of the level and range of giving—in-kind, time and money—of Native people to Native and non-Native religious and spiritual activities and groups.

ENCOURAGING INCREASED NATIVE-AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY

The philanthropic community can help stimulate increased Native-American institutionalized giving by:

- Educating Native-American business owners on the benefits of charitable giving;
 - Countering negative images that portray Indians as helpless and poor;
 - Working with tribal colleges to develop a curriculum on civic participation and philanthropy that respects Native traditions and history;
 - Translating philanthropy into a language that is understandable to indigenous communities, which may include programs in schools, clubs, civic groups, community centers and
-

other relevant venues;

- Engaging tribal elders in developing roles for tribes in charitable activities;
- Recognizing and building on one of the greatest sources of giving—successful Indian tribes;
- Creating an on-line database of culturally relevant models and vehicles for giving appropriate for tribal communities; and
- Promoting traditional methods of giving through familiar and kinship arrangements.

BUILDING CAPACITY OF NATIVE-AMERICAN NONPROFITS TO STIMULATE GIVING

An increasing number of individuals in economically successful tribal communities are for the first time amassing wealth in many aspects of their life (financial, educational, material, etc.). Expressions of interest abound in participating in charitable and other civic activities. Foundations and intermediary organizations (such as Native Americans in Philanthropy and others) might sponsor training and technical assistance opportunities for these communities in investment, estate and financial planning as it relates to charitable activities. Specifically,

- Foundations might use challenge or matching grants to encourage development of endowments in Indian country;
- Partnerships and collaborations might help stimulate philanthropy in areas with concentrations of Native-American populations;
- Small planning grants could fund feasibility studies or other development- and capacity-building needs to ascertain an organization's readiness and potential for an endowment.
- An on-line service might be developed to connect Native and non-Native donors to those in need in the Native community;
- Training programs might be offered to Native organizations on board, staff, fundraising and resource development; and
- Consulting firms and non-Native development officers could be educated on Native traditions and cultures.

It is critical to keep in mind the unique character and scope of Native American giving when developing ways to implement these recommendations. To stimulate more philanthropy, a program must be designed at the local level, respecting tradition as well as the different styles and forms of giving in the diverse Native communities.

NATIVE-AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY: EXPANDING SOCIAL PARTICIPATION AND SELF-DETERMINATIONS

Once the poorest segment of the American society, some Native-American communities are now rising to new economic levels, in part, as a result of success from commercial enterprise and entrepreneurial activities—developments heretofore limited to only a few Native-American individuals, organizations and tribes. In some cases, this success has translated into greater economic power that, as measured by indicators such as consumer spending, show that Native Americans now contribute strongly in terms of consumer dollars—they spent an estimated \$10 billion in 1997.¹ In some states, most notably Arizona and New Mexico, they generated an average of 16 percent of the state's income.² In addition, in states such as Connecticut, Minnesota and New Mexico, Native-American businesses are rapidly becoming the major employers and active participants in community affairs. These successes and indicators, however significant, pale in comparison with the contributions Native people make within their own communities through informal and institutional acts of generosity.

Encouraging expanded Native-American participation in philanthropy is important for many reasons. Key among them is the fact that most reports describe the Native community as recipient, rather than purveyor, of gifts. Stories of the poor and governmentally dependent conditions of Native communities are widespread—but in some cases are now outdated and constitute a form of stereotyping. Although the incidence of poverty and economic depression remain disproportionately high in Native communities,³ accelerated economic and social systems are propelling some Native communities into a new era of relative prosperity. Some are channeling their “new wealth” into projects for community rebuilding. Others are supporting projects beyond their boundaries. This new wealth, combined with an innate generosity, offers the larger philanthropic community a unique opportunity to reach out to those who once were on the fringe of social, political and economic systems, and enable them to participate more fully and equally in civic and community affairs. Such participation would help to diversify many facets of philanthropy, while providing Native and non-Native communities with an opportunity to:

- Enhance cultural awareness and understanding of different traditions and practices;
 - Leverage new resources for community building in diverse areas;
 - Alter perceptions of Native Americans from dependent and poor to creative and generous; and
-

- Promote greater self determination and independence.

Expanding philanthropic networks might also help to alleviate some poverty in less fortunate Native communities by targeting resources to those areas. Although some funds have been targeted to these communities, according to a 1996 survey conducted by Native Americans in Philanthropy, only 100 foundations made contributions to Native causes in the United States, comprising only \$41 million in contributions. This reflects only a small percentage of the \$7 billion contributed by all foundations to charitable causes, of which Native foundations gave \$2.75 million, or 9 percent, of that total.⁴

These data represent a growing need to look further into the unique philanthropic contributions of Native people and their potential for expanded participation in the independent sector. As such, this report examines the philanthropic impulse—the motivations, preferences and interests—of more than 48 generous and influential Native Americans, Indian tribes and organizations interviewed during 1998. The interviews were conducted as part of a Council on Foundations project designed to enhance the inclusiveness of formalized philanthropy. Supported by the Ford, W. K. Kellogg and David and Lucile Packard foundations, the project reflects a growing interest by mainstream philanthropic leaders to understand better Native-American giving traditions and potential.

PHILANTHROPIC POTENTIAL OF NATIVE-AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

Recent accounts of Native-American giving indicate that the number of Native grantmakers is on the rise. Legal shifts, commercial successes and entrepreneurial activities are part of the reasons for this increase. According to a report by Native Americans in Philanthropy, the number of Native grantmakers grew from 3 to 32 between 1973 and 1996, and donations extended beyond charity to economic development, cultural preservation, environmental protection and other fields.⁵ Indeed, in the past two years, Native grantmaking tribes and organizations have increased by 50 percent or more. Native-American giving, which is very much reflective of their communal orientation—particularly in tribal settings—is expressed not only in more formal exchanges but also in less formal assignments of time, goods and spiritual activities.

Important economic factors are beginning to influence Native-American giving patterns as well. As more Native Americans achieve educational, professional and entrepreneurial success, their interest and ability to formalize their giving is likely to increase. The continued success of tribal enterprises—gaming, resorts, energy—may also result in new opportunities for individuals to participate in charitable ventures. Interest and involvement in entrepreneurial ventures is on the rise in Indian country. Based on Census Bureau data:

- The number of businesses owned by American Indians and Alaska Natives increased 93 percent from 52,980 in 1987 to 102,234 between 1987 and 1992;
 - Receipts increased by more than 115 percent from \$3.7 billion to \$8.1 billion; and
-

- More than 80 percent of the firms owned by American Indians and Alaska Natives in 1992, were sole proprietorships.⁶

A key element of this success resides in education. Educational advancements, as reflected in the growth of tribally controlled colleges and the creation of the American Indian Science and Engineering Society, the American Indian Graduate Center, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium and Native-American programs at universities, are paralleling an increase in Native college students.⁷ Graduation rates of Native students are on the rise.⁸ Through education, Indian tribes are realizing that the “New Buffalo,” often associated with gaming, is

“Some think that gaming is critical to economic development in Native-American communities, but the future of the Native community in some areas is in small businesses.”—Patrick Borunda, a Mescalera Apache/Tarahumara businessman and head of a Portland, Oregon, Native nonprofit

now attributed to higher education—which will enable them to compete in the larger society.⁹ Indian tribes that are successful in business and in educational achievements are also witnessing changing relationships with vendors and other professionals through increased loans, services and marketed products. In response to recent successes and educational advances, many law firms are establishing Indian law departments and hiring Native lawyers, and banks and investment houses are seeking business in Native communities.¹⁰

As important as education and employment in business and the professions are, entrepreneurial activities are fueling growth in Native communities. According to Patrick Borunda, a Mescalera Apache/Tarahumara businessman and head of a Portland, Oregon, Native nonprofit, “Some think that gaming is critical to economic development in Native-American communities, but the future of the Native community in some areas is in small businesses.”¹¹ With an infusion of gaming dollars, for example, a number of Indian tribes formed a professional network to strengthen private enterprise on their reservations. The network, the Native American Business Network, raised \$1 million and offers assistance to tribal members who are interested in business pursuits.¹²

For these and other reasons, some Native communities are emerging as larger and more viable participants in the formalized philanthropic arena. These communities may offer both financial opportunities and a wealth of untapped creativity, leadership and material resources that could greatly enhance the civic construct of the philanthropic community. Culturally relevant philanthropic vehicles, advanced in more modern forms, may provide the mechanisms for Native funds (tribal and nonprofit) to build capacity, restore their communities and cultural traditions and enhance their Native identity in the larger community. By examining the ongoing philanthropic and entrepreneurial endeavors of Native communities, their roots, traditions and goals, this report will shed light on the emergence of more institutional philanthropic activities, many of which have been the subject of only limited research.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PHILANTHROPY IN NATIVE-AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

“I honor you by giving ... you honor me by receiving.” From the beginning, such words were understood not as formal decrees but as natural blessings through ritual, ceremonies, spiritual events and familial activities as well as governance systems, political processes and other means of engagement. This understanding remains today as Native communities have evolved through periods of acculturation, colonization and discrimination. Against these odds, in some cases, according to Vine Deloria, a noted Native historian, “Native communities existed with little sense of purpose and vision for the future,”¹³ but with the will to survive and prosper.

Each period of transition (allotment,¹⁴ termination¹⁵ and relocation¹⁶) posed new challenges to the philanthropic fabric of the different indigenous communities. In prosperous years, there were hearty feasts and support networks beyond tribal boundaries. Indian tribes, however, experienced only brief periods of wealth (monetary) leading to periods of boom and bust and sometimes back again. These conditions, according to one Native-American service organization leader from Colorado, affected many Native communities deeply as, “there were several boom-and-bust cycles and almost every time after a boom, there was a bust cycle and you saw wealth and then you saw poverty and you saw it in the same community.”

“American Indians and European settlers had very different cognitive maps: the cultural disposition of Native Americans were much more subjective, more influenced by individual experiences with nature, the spirits, and the power being that inhabits the natural world.”—James A. Joseph, former president and CEO of the Council on Foundations.

Through bust-and-boom years and despite colonization, acculturation and periodic relocation to urban and other rural areas, Native people always believed in and practiced their own form of philanthropy. They were in fact the first American philanthropists. From the time European settlers arrived in America, they survived with gifts of corn, squash and beans, as well as the herbal medicine and planting and fertilizing techniques of the American Indians.¹⁷

Upon their settlement, Europeans brought with them a philosophy of giving, steeped in religion and economics, that differed greatly from that of the indigenous peoples inhabiting the new land.¹⁸ A great divide opened between indigenous giving practices and those of the settlers. James A. Joseph, former president and CEO of the Council on Foundations, described this divide by suggesting that, “American Indians and European settlers had very different cognitive maps; the cultural disposition of Native Americans was much more subjective, more influenced by individual experiences with nature, the spirits, and the power being that inhabits the natural world.”¹⁹ Exchanges of goods and services, ingrained in the indigenous norms, were the key to their social relationships. A common custom, then and now, is the giveaway and potlatch, which remain as a way of embracing familial and extended kin in a ritual of exchange.²⁰ Common to

Native Americans in the northwest coastal region, the potlatch, a Chinook term, was a way for elites (tribal leaders) to distribute goods to their guests. It was an exchange of gifts that carried the expectation of reciprocation with interest.²¹ To some, it was motivated by social integration, reaffirmation of social positions among peers and gamesmanship. It was not considered particularly philanthropic in a Western context, but as indigenous societies sought to build their assets, they typically used a series of gift exchanges that were closely associated with social status and the indigenous wealth system.²² One of the more formal exchanges was the barter system—trading goods as a medium of exchange—which remains the closest to modern philanthropy.²³

Significant changes in Native-American philanthropy marked the period following European colonization. The social structures of tribal societies were destroyed, the bonds of family and kinship were altered and a new psychology of dependence was introduced.²⁴ According to James Joseph, the notion of community, once reflected in tribal terms, took on a pan-Indian character as many Native Americans settled in cities and towns. Native people developed voluntary groups and self-help associations that largely resembled those of the majority population residing in that community. Like other ethnic communities, Native Americans sought refuge in “fraternal and social clubs which were established to help retain their Indian identity or to extend help to those in need (i.e., Teepee Order, American Indian Association, Wigwam Club, etc.).”²⁵ This relationship with the non-Native community served as the basis for future associations. Some Native people were so integrated into mainstream society that they grew further away from their traditional roots and aligned with the practices, customs and social system of Euro-Americans. Through periodic migration, warfare and the relocation of some Native communities, voluntary trade and mutual assistance between non-Natives and Natives and among Indian tribes such as the Menominee and Pottawatomie and even the Suak and Fox were disrupted.²⁶ This caused skepticism and resentment among trading partners—altering reciprocal relationships of sharing, exchanging and mutual aid.

From early on in urban areas, the activities of the various clubs, whether fraternal, social or educational, and the leadership of the organizations, tended to blend both Indian and white cultures.²⁷ Cultural assimilation, according to Jack Weatherford, a noted historian, meant that “American Indians who transformed foreigners into ‘Americans’ and grafted European society onto an ancient heritage, were influenced by the economic, political and social life and the practices of the settlers.”²⁸ Even with changes in relationships, through treaties, laws, regulations and discriminatory actions, according to one Native scholar from Minnesota, Native people and Euro-Americans maintained an understanding of “you need us as we need you.” Such associations were reflected in some societies, like that of the Anishnabeg, where numerous examples of benevolence among communities existed, such as the Grand Medicine Society, “Midewiwin.” Healing and caring for the sick were (and still are) expressions of altruism, and exchanges of goods and healing knowledge in rituals were the conduit for philanthropy,²⁹ among Natives and non-Natives alike.

As time passed and societal pressures changed, groups formed that were reformist, political, religious and traditionalist—the Society of American Indians, Ghost Dance, American Indian Movement, etc.³⁰ Much of the more formal giving in and among Native communities re-

sponded to these societal movements. At the same time, Native communities also began to establish more formal and structured relationships with the federal and state governments; they became familiar and comfortable with support guided by law and entitlements. Along with their proactive involvement in these societal movements, their medium of exchange (governmental support) changed—once somewhat dependent, now dependent “wards of the state.” These dynamics markedly altered the indigenous perspective on institutional philanthropy. It greatly influenced the way in which Native communities give and receive gifts outside their own communities. It also changed the relationship between the Native and non-Native communities in the exchange of goods and services. No longer was there a system of mutual exchange, as James Joseph notes, but rather a subordinate relationship where “Native Americans’ desire for independence and self-help deeply imbedded in the culture of the group (tribe) as well as in the psyche of the individual, and the strong dependence on government, not of their own choosing, was at odds with the aspirations, inclinations and civic traditions of their community.”³¹ Dependence on federal and state government profoundly affected the culture, family and kinship ties and the economic and political systems. The psychology of dependence permeated communities and individuals, affected their ability and interest in saving for the future, stymied creativity and, in some cases, stalled their more institutional philanthropy.

Although government support fostered dependence, Indian tribes, as sovereign nations, were recognized as independent entities. In many cases they in fact were viewed as “dependent sovereigns.” As such, they confronted constant challenges to uphold their proper status. As sovereign nations, Indian tribes were vested with their own governmental powers, recognized by federal law and affirmed many times by the U.S. Supreme Court as early as 1832, when Chief Justice John Marshall wrote:³²

The Indian Nations [have always been considered as] distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original rights, as the undisputed possessors of the soil from time immemorial

A basic right of any sovereign power is to choose its form of government. Federal law recognizes the right of Indian tribes to enact civil and criminal laws as well as to charter and regulate corporations and nonprofit organizations.³³ Such laws and designations distinguish Indian tribes from nonprofits in their requirements for incorporation, reporting and audits, and, therefore, afford tribes different treatment for tax and charitable contributions. Many tribes began to use these laws to their proper advantage.

On the heels of the civil rights era, in the 1960s, many Indian tribes sought self-determination and self-governance and developed new strategies for economic development. Some turned to various forms of entrepreneurship. Many Indian tribes built successful commercial enterprises in manufacturing, service industries and other fields (e.g., Mississippi Choctaws, Jicarilla Apache and Pasmaquoddy Indians), and some formed consortia to manage and protect their natural resources (e.g., Council for Energy Resource tribes and Native Environmental Council).³⁴

Similar growth and development occurred in private philanthropy. In the 1970s, private funding for Native nonprofits and projects came primarily from non-Native sources. These

sources, such as the Ford and MacArthur foundations (and others) and individual donors, initially focused support on Native Americans' land claims, sovereignty and natural resources. Later funding was expanded to Native self-sufficiency and sustainability, children and families and the environment and eventually to revitalization of Native lifeways.

During the same period, Alaska Native communities underwent reorganization. In 1971, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA),³⁵ divided Alaska Native communities into 13 regional corporations—12 in Alaska and 1 outside the state in Seattle—and more than 200 separate village corporations.³⁶ Formation of these commercial centers also implied support for the general welfare of each community. Some corporations in more fertile areas produced new sources of revenues for their communities. From these revenues, some formed private foundations or public charities with annual contributions or lump-sum endowments. In addition, through the settlement of some land claims and law suits, some tribes allotted a portion of the awards to charitable pursuits (e.g., educational scholarships or special needs in the community).

Prompted by the needs of the time, in the mid-1980s, several Native-initiated and controlled philanthropic vehicles were launched.³⁷ They included organizations such as First Nations Development Institute, Hopi Foundation, Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development, American Indian College Fund and others. As Native communities became more involved in institutional philanthropy, they embraced it with unique cultural adaptations and emphasized their independence and self-identity by continuing their community and culture.³⁸

"The Indian Nations [have always been considered as] distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original rights, as the undisputed possessors of the soil from time immemorial..."—U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall

Since the late 1980s and the initiation of gaming and other commercial enterprises, many entrepreneurial activities were initiated in Indian country. Some Indian tribes achieved economic success through these ventures, particularly gaming. Success brought new challenges. Through regulation and laws, such as the 1987 Supreme Court decision,³⁹ *California v. the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians*—where the Court recognized and affirmed the right of Indian tribes to conduct full-scale gaming on their reservations and land, the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA)⁴⁰ was enacted to set guidelines for gaming activities on Indian lands. Under IGRA, tribal governments are required to use gaming profits for certain purposes, including funding tribal government operations, providing for the general welfare of the tribe and its members, for tribal economic development and to help fund local government agencies. Some gaming revenues were directed toward charitable causes as well (e.g., educational scholarships, rehabilitation centers, housing, and health clinics).

Gaming has helped Indian tribes rebuild and diversify their tribal economies. Ten years ago, for example, the economies of tribes in the Sault Saint Marie, Michigan, area consisted of only a few businesses (e.g., a gas station, convenience store and bingo hall). Following IGRA, the tribes initiated 17 businesses in construction, hotels, restaurants, charter air service and others, and

created five casinos that drew \$267 million in 1995.⁴¹ For the Oneida of New York, a similar experience allowed them, for example, “...to bring back their ceremonies, and language and to have elders record their memories to create a living oral history...”⁴² The Oneidas, which own the Turning Stone Casino, earned more than \$121.8 million since its opening, which helped them to establish new enterprises in printing, cattle farming, housing and community centers, hotels and other projects.”⁴³

Some Native and non-Native nonprofits and Indian tribes benefited from gaming successes as well. The Mashantucket Pequot of Connecticut, for example, gave \$135 million for a research center and museum for an array of tribal artifacts—particularly from Northeastern tribes, \$500,000 to the Hartford Ballet, \$5 million to the Mystic aquarium, \$700,000 for a minor league stadium in Norwich, \$2 million to the Special Olympics World Games in New Haven, and \$10 million to the Smithsonian Institution’s National Museum of the American Indian. They also provided \$700,000 for an independent film, “Naturally Native,”⁴⁴ which brings Native cultures to popular audiences. Their charitable impulse loomed large as totals rose above \$150 million for funding extra-tribal projects.⁴⁵

Since the passage of IGRA,⁴⁶ more than 198 Indian tribes have gained compacts in 28 states (slightly more than one-third of the federally recognized Indian tribes in the United States), 310 have built gaming facilities with Class I, II, and III compacts, and more than \$7.4 billion has been generated in annual revenues.⁴⁷ Of the tribes with gaming, however, only a small percentage have realized significant profits.⁴⁸ These tribes are generally small (in membership) and geographically located near large urban and commercial centers. Most only recently transitioned out of poverty. For many successful tribes, gaming is considered “a source of badly needed cash, which permits them to do what neither the federal government nor tribal neighbors have been willing to do.”⁴⁹ Viewed this way, gaming is not an end, it is simply a means to tap into the mainstream economy of America. Other accounts extend this notion to prior circumstances where “before the gaming boom, reservations were considered the poorest areas in the United States, and although many are still poor, gaming has proven to be a cure for poverty for tribes such as the Oneidas of Wisconsin, Prairie Island and Shakopee Sioux of Minnesota, Mashantucket Pequots of Connecticut and others.”⁵⁰

Contrary to public reports, however, only one in ten tribes with gaming enterprises are fortunate enough to produce significant revenues.⁵¹ The top 5 tribes with gaming enterprises account for 45 percent of the total gaming revenues.⁵² In the broader economic market, Indian gaming is only a small proportion of the Las Vegas and Atlantic City gaming revenues. In the mid-1990s, for example, Indian reservation gaming accounted for only 5 percent of the revenue market share of total U.S. gaming revenues of \$29.9 billion.⁵³ Although Indian gaming revenues are rising each year, they remain a small percentage of total gaming revenues.⁵⁴ There is a wide separation among the few successful gaming enterprises on Indian lands and those struggling to exist.⁵⁵ For example, the Oglala Sioux of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota operate a casino that earns \$1 million a year, which reflects only a small percentage of the daily earnings of the most successful tribes with gaming enterprises.⁵⁶

New wealth among some successful tribes has prompted creative forms of self-help and entrepreneurial ventures. Such ventures include the formation of capital sources through American Indian banks, as well as leveraged support for indigenous philanthropy through Native service organizations and foundations.⁵⁷ Successful tribes have made some inroads in fulfilling the needs of Indian country, but their loyalties to their own communities and the larger Native population are balanced with political and external pressures.

Indian tribes, in a position to give (of which there are relatively few), are overwhelmed by requests, and tend to care for the pressing needs of their own community before considering others. Many projects and causes compete for support from successful casinos. In one recent account, a tribal member noted that “educational activities compete for funds with health clinics, schools, water systems, housing, day care and services for the elderly.”⁵⁸ Many tribes with gaming enterprises are also fearful of governmental reprisals (federal or state legislation and regulation) resulting from publicizing their wealth through charitable donations. Reprisals have occurred: California is one of many states where there has been highly charged government threats to tribal gaming and sovereignty.⁵⁹

CULTURAL UNDERPINNINGS OF NATIVE-AMERICAN PHILANTHROPY

Culture also plays a key role in Native philanthropy. In traditional Native-American societies, gift giving has been part of the rites performed for birth, puberty, marriage, death and other major ceremonies. Giving is a form of sharing, not charity. The focus is on the exchange and the relationship of the giver and receiver. Differences between these values and traditions and those of mainstream Euro-American philanthropy, have caused many in the Native community to be uncertain in their pursuit of private support as well as hesitant in their offers of formal gifts. The variance of values in Native and non-Native communities is the root of tension between institutional giving and more indigenous forms of giving. As Native communities move from informal to more formalized giving, so too will their worldviews and lifeways. These worldviews, expressed by Winona LaDuke, a former director of the White Earth Land Recovery Project, suggest that in cultures such as the Ojibway, “altruism does not simply spring from humanitarian values, but from a complex of cosmological values connecting people with their ancestors, the land and the whole of creation.”⁶⁰

Giving in Native-American communities differs from concepts that underlie Euro-American philanthropy, particularly as they pertain to terms of obligation and responsibility, stewardship and ownership, wealth, affluence and generosity, charity, gifts and exchange as well as more systemic processes manifested in lifestyles such as circular and communal, as opposed to more linear and individualistic. These differing beliefs and styles play a major role in the evolution of informal to more formalized philanthropy. As such, their presence is woven throughout this report and described as follows:

- In some Euro-American communities, giving is seen as the responsibility of one person to another and as a form of power or prestige. In many Native communities, however, there is an obligation to pass a gift on, not as means of power, but as an extension of
-

honor to the generations to come and to other kin or clan members. Giving symbolizes an expression of interest in the larger world.

- As stewards of all worldly resources, Native Americans seek reconnection with self, family, community and nature. In so doing, their gifts generally reflect the use of only what is necessary, not an accumulation of resources (money, material, etc.). Their culture is built on the coexistence of humans and nature as stewards, not owners, of land, goods or other resources. Giving is a means of passing resources and knowledge to others to nurture and manage. Euro-Americans, on the other hand, inherited a system of ownership (property, material, power) as a means of accumulating wealth. Their giving is a product of this accumulation.
 - Many terms for generosity exist in Native languages. For example, in many Native communities, leaders are chosen for their ability to care for their people and share their wealth. Their ability to achieve this allows them to attain a certain level of prestige. This prestige results from their generosity, not only of money, but also of knowledge (spiritual, nature, etc.), goods, time and emotions. All forms of generosity are part of the cosmology of life in Native communities. In Euro-American terms, there is usually a single meaning for generosity; often equated to a monetary medium that is charitable or philanthropic. Similarly, affluence, as referred by Euro-Americans, is singularly termed as a state of abundance (monetary and material wealth). Viewed in this context, affluence does not easily translate into Native languages as material and monetary wealth are generally shared communally, and wealth or affluence, like generosity, is multifaceted, not necessarily based on finances, but on spiritual, conceptual, material (artifacts) and natural terms.
 - Among Native-American societies, there are many forms of exchanges. The barter system, for example, in its modern variation, is an exchange that encourages equality in giving and receiving, whereby the giver is as respected as the receiver is honored. It is personal and spiritual and usually based on mutual respect. Such acts of mutuality belie the Euro-American philanthropic system. Euro-American giving is inherently based on power relationships; the giver bestows the honor of the gift to the receiver, who gratefully accepts. It is somewhat impersonal, and highly structured. The gift is not perceived as a mutual exchange, but as an act of charity or benevolence.
 - In Native-American communities, giving is usually a communally centered act, largely based on the honor that the gift brings to the group. In contrast, Euro-American philanthropy is largely a human-centered act of benevolence by individuals or individual associations and institutions to enhance elite activities or to assist those in need.⁶¹
 - Native-American communities tend to rely on circular or concentric relationships, beginning with the individual and expanding to the family, the clan, the tribal community, the larger Native population and beyond. Each layer of the circle is interdependent on the next for all forms of support including “relief or charitable” offerings. In contrast, the Euro-American philanthropic system is based on linear, hierarchical and structured relationships.
-

These concepts, ever present in the pathway toward institutional philanthropy, pose great challenges to mainstream communications, language, philosophies, governance and social and interpersonal relations; all integral to formalized charitable exchanges. The following sections describe in more detail these potential obstacles and sources of enrichment to mainstream philanthropy.

Different Worldviews

The different worldviews of giving between Native and non-Native communities are vast. Among them are those that pertain to wealth, ownership and nature. Euro-American interests are based on personal property rights, market economies, wealth accumulation and consumerism. Traditional Native societies rely on communal ownership, socialized (or communal) economies, redistribution of wealth and the spiritual connection to nature. Many Native societies follow a tradition of sharing and honoring that is not based on altruism, but on mutual obligation. Put another way, a Native donor from Colorado claimed:

European laws provided for the ownership of real and personal property; European governmental and religious institutions were based on feudal “command and control systems.” These value systems differ from Native people, since one is based on cooperation, the other on competition, and one on sharing, and the other on accumulation.

“Giving your wealth away to benefit others helped to create harmony among the tribes and the balance of wealth throughout the Native community. It differs from the European system because it involves people who are on parallel economic levels, rather than the rich giving to the poor.”—A Native service organization leader from Colorado

A Native service organization leader from Colorado further declared that:

Giving your wealth away to benefit others helped to create harmony among the tribes and the balance of wealth throughout the Native community. It differs from the European system because it involves people who are on parallel economic levels, rather than the rich giving to the poor.

LaDonna Harris, a member of the Comanche Indian Tribe, further explained giving by suggesting that “you should never own anything that can’t be given away.”⁶² A Native grantmaker and scholar from Oklahoma summed it up by stating that:

Our way of life extends outward in concentric circles to family, tribal nation and the world. If the inner circle is strong enough, it reflects outward through our work with our families and communities.

According to Gail Small, a Northern Cheyenne lawyer, even the Native view of the environment is more expansive than in Western culture; it includes cultural survival.⁶³ An active

supporter of Native lifeways, Winona LaDuke, likened these differences to survivalist attitudes whereby “people should take only what they need” and if one must kill, “it is because the [animal] gave of itself, it is not a human conquest, but a way for the individual to sustain themselves.”⁶⁴ “A society based on conquest, like the Euro-American system, is not sustaining,” according to LaDuke, “it is based on consumption and ownership.”⁶⁵

Different Languages, Meanings and Philosophies

Within Native cultures are many terms and meanings for generosity. Some denote care for others, others extend messages to friends, family, kin, etc. All, however, highlight how people share with each other and nature and honor one another. Different cultures assign meanings and languages to concepts that alter their translation from one term to another. The following words refer to some aspect of generosity in several indigenous cultures:⁶⁶

- aa ni tse ba kees (Navajo),
- Ah da ne hi (Eastern Cherokee),
- Baawaailuuo (Crow),
- Gondowwe (Onelda of Wisconsin),⁶⁷
- hotochaestse (Cheyenne),
- iikimmapi’ii (Blackfeet),
- kwti+xest (Salish),
- Mah-sagi (Hidatsa),
- Maw-Maw/Weyah-Skah-sit/Mah-che-toe (Menominee),⁶⁸
- moho kul hoolaaanh (Koyukon; Doyon area of Alaska)⁶⁹
- Naki-sahnes-hu (Arikara),
- Nicomo (Narragansett),⁷⁰
- qa upyi ti (Kootenai),
- tsrou-cu-we (Keres; Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico),⁷¹
- gunuitug (Yupik Eskimo),⁷²
- Wancantognaka (Lakota), and
- zhaaweni (Ojibway).

Each term bears variations in the type and essence of generosity. Marjane Ambler, editor of the *Tribal College Journal*, described these variations by stating that “in English there is one word for generosity and another for sharing,⁷³ but Native language speakers have several terms for each, such as the Crow word “baawaailuuo,” which refers to generosity of material items, but another word would be used for emotional generosity.⁷⁴ Beyond terms, even learning ceremonies and songs demand generosity of time and spirit and with that comes prestige within the community.”⁷⁵ The meaning, but not the term, “Euro-American philanthropy,” is interpreted and understood within many different concepts and definitions in Indian country and passed

from one generation to the next. In many Native cultures, languages are not written, but only spoken, some with only limited speakers and no written record. Generosity is expressed in stories, actions and images.

Some Native communities look to their religious teachings to inform their giving. For example, some Indian tribes consider the four directions as a guide for life and the seventh generation⁷⁶ for perspective on the past, present and future.⁷⁷ Giving is very much inspired by these tenets. Whirlwind Soldier, a member of the Lakota, explained that, in her culture, “Wancantognaka means sharing not only material goods, but generosity of heart, comfort and support.” She claimed that “giveaways are part of every spiritual ceremony, memorial and honoring and they underscore the commitment to caring and sharing.”⁷⁸ In an Ojibway context, philanthropy is part of the tribal way of life symbolized through gifts, thanksgivings and relationships.⁷⁹ Compassion is seen as an element of philanthropy. Acts of mercy to relieve suffering and voluntary assistance to improve the quality of life are integral to daily life in indigenous communities.⁸⁰ According to an elder from a plains tribe, “American Indian traditions teach the basic fundamentals of good living,” younger generations learn that being healthy is essential to leading a good life. Balance in all parts of life as envisioned by a medicine wheel—spiritual, mental, physical and emotional—are needed to produce a healthy person. Spirituality underlies all aspects of the medicine wheel;⁸¹ caring, sharing and compassion are within the treads of the wheel.

Giving practices also reflect regional and local characteristics. For example, in the Southwest, a member of a New Mexico tribe described it this way:

Giving in our community has been primarily through social organizations like the family and religion; the family is a major part of a larger planned system. If you view the clan as a social organization, the clan itself is designed to function both as a religious and social mechanism, it supports the extended family, and fosters the role of philanthropy in a circular system whereby you are constantly giving to the community for the perpetuation of traditions and customs [otherwise known as a mutual benefit system].

Another respected member of an Oklahoma tribe suggested that giving is linked to the natural process where, “upon death, if you do not give, you weaken the spirit.”

From a Southeastern perspective, one member of a North Carolina tribe noted that: “We organize a benefit and families get together and gather food to share with others.” Each member is responsible for an aspect of the exchange. It is understood, “there is no formal ask.”

In an Alaska Native community, one tribal member from Juneau stated that

the culture is built around giving away wealth as soon as it’s accumulated through potlatches and other means. It is done on behalf of the clan and families reciprocating for something that another clan had done for them.

In Northeastern tribal traditions, one of the more sacred gifts is “the gift of life.” Those who contribute to such high aspirations are truly honored as three sisters experienced when they “grew beans, white corn and squash to provide nutrition to the land and to the spirits”; they

were honored in a series of traditional thanksgiving rituals.⁸² These gifts symbolized the connection of all worldly resources to the vitality of the past, present and future.

In Native-American cultures, philanthropy broadly means the honor of giving and receiving. It is not a term readily associated with indigenous giving. In practice, however, many terms are used in place of philanthropy, such as sharing, obligation, exchange, reciprocity, helping, being noble, mutual respect, community, sponsoring, partnering and collaborating or terms that relate to ritualistic or ceremonial activities such as potlatch, giveaway, offerings, honorings and feasts. In some Native communities, the idea of philanthropy, not the word, is associated with “fundraising or grants” from other sources both public and more recently private. The term, philanthropy is sometimes used synonymously with receiving, rather than giving. This may be due, according to a Native fundraiser, to “a history of dependence fostered by federal and state governmental programs, which inculcated mixed messages of entitlement through grants.”

Many Native grantmakers and scholars also differentiate terms used in mainstream philanthropy from those referred to in Native communities. For example, “community organizing” defined in the Euro-American context is more activist or economic, whereas Native communities refer to cultural or preservationist activities.⁸³ Terms such as social change, economic development and grant year may be referred to in some Native communities as continuity, way of life, subsistence lifestyle and seventh generation.⁸⁴

“The bottom line in giving for most Indian tribes is survival; leaders are chosen for their ability to take care of the tribe and share their wealth.”—Marjane Ambler

Differences in Leadership and Lifestyles

Throughout the literature on Native-American philanthropy, giving is closely aligned with leadership and survival. Marjane Ambler summed it up by stating that, “the bottom line in giving for most Indian tribes is survival; leaders are chosen for their ability to take care of the tribe and share their wealth.”⁸⁵ Tribal leaders play a key role in fostering philanthropic activities. Survival is rooted deeply in generations of Native communities, prompting an impulse for many forms of giving. Many tribes, through their leadership, view charitable activities as investments in their own communities. Some see giving as part of an ethical code of survival, as suggested by a Native donor from Colorado, who claimed that, “giving is part of the ethics of stewardship; preservation for the next generation.” In a paper by Ron Wells, a prominent advisor to Native organizations, for example, Wilma Mankiller, a former Principal Chief of the Oklahoma Cherokee, noted that “one of the things that holds communities together is a land base, so tribal communities that have a land base may have a stronger sense of interdependence.”⁸⁶ Also in that paper, Darrell Kipp, a linguist from the Blackfeet tribe, commented that, “giving and receiving are a regulatory means of maintaining social order.”⁸⁷ Native lifestyles, as pointed out by a Native fundraiser from Wisconsin, impart

an intergenerational interdependence such as in giveaways, honorings and feasts, which are all part of an exchange. They allow individuals to recognize the work and deeds of others and the roles they have played in their life; it is not a form of self-aggrandizement. The difference is bestowing the honor, rather than receiving the distinction for giving it.

This seamless quality to Native-American philanthropy contrasts with the more compartmentalized approach characteristic of many Euro-American communities. Native communities do not separate voluntary service and sharing from their communal life or lifeway, much of which is guided by their leadership.⁸⁸

Different Communications Processes

Philanthropy relies on communication and relationships. It is in these areas that, perhaps, the greatest differences exist, particularly in the style and transmission of messages between Native and non-Native communities. In a traditional Native community, for example, goals and tasks are developed using circular or consensus decisionmaking. This process, according to Ron Wells, helps build support by working in “concentric circles of relationships (e.g., family, kin, clan and community), which empowers the tribe or individual to build trust relationships, cooperation and successful programs and it enables the participants to express their views from the “heart and not just the mind.”⁸⁹ In contrast, Euro-Americans, according to a Native donor from Colorado, use more hierarchical, structured “command and control” methods. These differences are central to gift giving. In Native communities, gifts are part of collective satisfaction, while in the mainstream, they are individualistic or leadership-focused (i.e., the leaders of a foundation or organization are usually credited with the success of a gift). Also, in Native traditions, learning, sharing and communicating are often conveyed through storytelling. Stories pass on values and beliefs integral to giving.

Another facet of Native-American interpersonal relations is described by Jimm Tracks, a Native-American scholar, as an “underlying quality of noninterference—a principle of voluntary cooperation, rather than coercion to insure cooperation.” Based on this principle, Tracks asserts that respect and consideration are the highest form of interaction in Native communities. For example, a Native person planning a gathering or giveaway for a naming or celebration may not urge others to attend; it would interfere with their right to free choice.⁹⁰ Those who wish to attend, however, would do so at their will, after being informed of the event or need. Such behavior may have real implications for indigenous philanthropy in confronting more Western forms of fundraising or promotional events, which often rely on peer pressure and other ways to induce giving.⁹¹ According to a Native research institute, indigenous forms of learning, sharing and communicating are often exchanged through storytelling. Stories pass on values and beliefs integral to giving.⁹²

Differences in Demographic, Social and Economic Conditions

Many traditions of giving and receiving exist in Indian country. Some are cast in rituals such as potlatches, giveaways and feasts, while others are familial and informal and still others are governmental and more progressive. These beliefs are all part of an expansive network of

separate nations, each with its own unique demographics and structures. Key to understanding these networks is to view Indian tribes as nations, not groups, special interests or causes. As such, they respond to matters of state, with unique cultural practices, and are guided by laws, principles, treaties and communal belief systems. Among nations, however, many Indian tribes converge with some common traits: an interest in exchanges. That is, givers are respected as much as receivers are honored.

“As more Native people experience giving through family, kin, colleagues and classmates, they too will give.”—A Native community foundation officer from Minnesota

Passed on from generation to generation, Native communities express their generosity regardless of their economic or social condition. Although much of Native America has experienced poverty and despair, one tribal member from Oklahoma observes that their despair is balanced with a sense of giving that places them “among the most generous in America on a per capita basis.” Josh Galper, of American Demographics, further declared that, “one of the poorest counties in the [United States], Apache County, Arizona (largely on the Navajo reservation), gives a higher percentage of their income to United Way than the national average.”⁹³ Much of this is due to culture, some to history and the rest to survival.

Social systems also underscore the importance of giving. According to John Grim, a scholar of religious studies, some of the more publicized social activities of Indian tribes include the Hodenosaunee-Iroquois rites of Thanksgiving; the Lakota sense of “mitakuye oyasin” or “all my relatives”; the renewing care of the Muskogee Green Corn Dance; the healing concerns of the Dine-Navajo; the namings by Apaches; and the communal values of the Pueblos and their ceremonial calendars.⁹⁴

NATIVE-AMERICAN DONOR MODELS

In many Native communities, a resurgence of interest in old ways and beliefs of philanthropy has occurred. By combining ancient traditions of giving, Indian tribes and Native people have blended mainstream forms of philanthropy with unique culturally relevant structures and processes. By blending the cultures and structures, many Native communities have been forced to “walk between two worlds,” absorbing new beliefs not always akin to their own. Between the new worlds, as a Native community foundation officer from Minnesota said “as more Native people experience giving through family, kin, colleagues and classmates, they too will give.” Like other communities, institutional giving is a learned activity.

Most Common Forms of Giving among Native Americans

Three main forms of giving common in Native communities are through individuals, organizations and Indian tribes. Each form relies on different charitable vehicles, depending on the goal

and program interest of the donor. Charitable activities are channeled through (in order of prevalence):

- Informal personal giving;⁹⁵
- Public charities (tribal foundations, nontribal funds and service associations);⁹⁶
- Tribal giving programs (enterprise, governmental, intertribal consortia);⁹⁷
- Workplace giving programs;
- Community foundation funds; and
- Private foundations.

Tribal enterprises,⁹⁸ which are operated by tribal governments, and public charities (on and off reservations) represent the majority of institutional philanthropy in Indian country. There are very few private foundations, except those formed by Alaska Native corporations as part of a legal mandate or shareholder interest, and a small number formed for personal considerations or tax advantages. Native communities are, however, creating corporate foundations, tribal foundations and operating foundations. In addition, Native service organizations are also making grants (i.e., the Native American Journalist Association, Council for Energy Resource Tribes, American Indian College Fund and American Indian Science and Engineering Society).⁹⁹

Indian tribes that are more traditional in their lifeways and governance tend to be more interested in the cultural and spiritual relevance of their gift and its implication to their community (e.g., Navajo, Hopi and Pueblo). The more progressive Indian tribes tend to consider more mainstream interests that emphasize education, the arts, economic development and entertainment (e.g., Chickasaw, Mashantucket Pequots, Viejas).

In Indian country, giving may differ according to the degree of traditionalism and progressiveness of the community. For example, Indian tribes that are more traditional in their lifeways and governance tend to be more interested in the cultural and spiritual relevance of their gift and its implication to their community (e.g., Navajo, Hopi and Pueblo). The more progressive Indian tribes tend to consider more mainstream interests that emphasize education, the arts, economic development and entertainment (e.g., Chickasaw, Mashantucket Pequots, Viejas).

Age and newness of wealth influence giving in Native communities as well. Such factors rise to importance because:

- The median age of the American Indian population is much younger than other communities in the United States (26 years old vs. 33 years old)¹⁰⁰; and
 - Personal giving (reservation and nonreservation based) is primarily derived from recent or “first generation” wealth.
-

Most Common Interests of Native Donors

Even though giving patterns and forms differ among Indian tribes and Native organizations, some of the common areas of more formalized philanthropy are:

- Education (scholarships for schools, memorials, internships, etc.);
- Cultural preservation;
- Economic development;
- Youth;
- Elderly services;
- Arts;
- Healthcare;
- Rehabilitation services (e.g., drug and alcohol addiction counseling);
- Environmental or natural resources; and
- Emergencies and disasters.

The largest categories of funding from Native grantmakers, regardless of charitable vehicle, are education (e.g., scholarships and institutional operations) and cultural preservation, followed by a growing interest in youth and related projects. Part of this may be due to an awareness, according to a Native Americans in Philanthropy (NAP) report which claims, “Native donors see children as ‘leaders of tomorrow,’ essential to preserving their Native heritage.”¹⁰¹ Native communities have responded to emergencies and disasters, such as floods, hurricanes and ice storms and often do so according to one Native advisor from California, “out of an understanding of the human and natural despair from these occurrences.”

Religious Giving

Noticeably absent from the list above is the level and extent of religious giving in Native communities. Like other ethnic communities, Native giving to religious or spiritual activities is very individual and informal and often centered on rituals and ceremonial activities (feasts, powwows, honorings, potlatches, giveaways, etc.). In some southwest, southeast and plains communities, Native-American ties to Catholic and Protestant churches are strong, but giving is relatively small, often done in pledges and individually based. Tribal members influenced by organized religion, like the Mormon Church, may give as a religious requirement. A few of the respondents in this study noted their involvement in the Mormon Church as one aspect of their giving. Beyond organized mainstream religious participation, however, one religious studies scholar noted, “Native people were inclined to give before the Spanish Christian missionaries built their church in the Pueblo plaza of Acoma”—an ancient belief system inculcated philanthropic activity for the communal good.¹⁰²

A number of voluntary religious associations enjoy significant Native participation. Many of these associations are tied to mainstream Christian denominations; they cross reservation boundaries and link with urban centers to bring assistance to needy Native families. The Crow people

of Montana, for example, give time, money and material to these charities.¹⁰³ Another venue for involvement in mainstream religious giving is larger groups with mainstream ties such as the National Tekakwitha Conference, a Roman Catholic organization with Native leadership that focuses on the relationship of indigenous spirituality and Christianity.¹⁰⁴ Outlets for religious giving are many in Native communities. As a recent report by the American Indian Research and Policy Institute stated, “Native spirituality is a way of life, not a denomination or organized institution.”¹⁰⁵ As such, sharing, caring and giving transcend denomination and permeate all aspects of Native life.

Tribally Focused Membership Organizations

Similar to religious institutions, tribally focused membership organizations play a role in Native philanthropy. Some Indian tribes consider membership in their service or support organizations (e.g., the National Congress of American Indians, National Indian Gaming Association and American Indian College Fund, etc.), which are Native controlled or initiated, as part of their giving. In some cases, Indian tribes and Native individuals also provide organizational support for projects and urgent needs.

Most Common Motivations for Giving in Native Communities

In general, traditional Native communities give to community and familial activities. Depending on the type and size of the donation, Native donors tend to be response-oriented, culturally driven and concerned about broad issues that affect local activities. They generally support Native-initiated or controlled efforts but also support non-Native organizations that focus on or influence indigenous issues.

The desire to support separate or mainstream organizations depends to a large degree on the:

- Location of the donor (reservation or urban area);
- Means of attaining wealth (tribal or individually derived wealth); and
- Traditional or progressive tribal cultures.

Giving may differ according to whether a person is socialized in an urban or reservation setting: reservation-based Indians tend to give to the family and to the community (tribal communities that have a land base may have a stronger sense of interdependence); while urban Indians tend to give to intertribal networks or pan-Indian activities.¹⁰⁶ Traditional societies tend to be more insular and less exposed to other mainstream communities and thus may not be predisposed to support mainstream organizations. In addition, if wealth is derived in a tribal community, as part of its related enterprises, tribal members may give to indigenous causes and projects. Individuals who derive their wealth outside of a reservation community may have been influenced by mainstream interests and give as a collegial connection.

Native people also give as a communal obligation, as witnessed by a member of a New Mexico tribe where “members of their tribe pledge themselves to be of service to the villages and make every effort to be a member in good standing of the community by contributing to public work, through volunteerism and money.”

Most Common Giving Styles among Native Donors

Research for this paper disclosed powerful factors that contribute to the different styles of giving in Native communities. Most of the respondents indicated that they:

- Prefer to make anonymous, need-based gifts;
- Respond to personal appeals through family or community relations;
- Prefer individuals and groups they know well;
- Like to participate in decisionmaking by serving on a board, committee or council and in events; and
- Follow a give-and-receive model: when one gives, it will come back, maybe not immediately, but sometime in the future—a mutual exchange relationship.

On more traditional reservations, individual donors often give anonymously or secretly, because giving is seen as a broad reciprocity, not for prestige or altruism, but as a relationship to the Creator and to the community.¹⁰⁷ Because Native grantmaking is more personal, it is usually more flexible and viewed as a means of “helping out.”¹⁰⁸ Native-American donors tend to be more holistic in their grantmaking by offering technical assistance, workshops and guidance as well as developing contact with grantees. This approach enables the donor to develop a relationship with the recipient that fosters greater understanding of and connection to a project and its needs.

Understanding the powerful factors that drive Native-American giving is critical to developing programs to expand institutional philanthropy in diverse communities. These factors reflect an intensely personal, participatory and/or communal style of giving.

ANALYSIS OF GIVING VEHICLES

Charitable Giving through Individuals¹⁰⁹

Unlike many other communities, Native people are rarely publicly noted for their generosity and almost never highlighted for their wealth. Such publications as *Fortune* or *Forbes* make little mention of Native benevolence, and ethnic-specific business sources, such as *Black Enterprise*, *Hispanic Business*, *A magazine* and others, are virtually nonexistent in the Native community. Save for a few Native newsletters, newspapers and journals (*Indian Giver*, *Indian Country*, *Native Americans in Philanthropy* newsletter, *National Indian Gaming Association* newsletter, *Tribal College Journal*, *Business Alert* and *Native Americas*, etc.) where audiences are limited and coverage may be more broadly encompassing of wealth, few resources highlight Native people of wealth, and only recently in the mainstream press, Native giving is treated peripherally in stories on gaming. Because the culture is very much communally based, most published materials focus on tribal-related gifts or non-Native gifts to Native communities. If an individual has been philanthropic, it is of interest more at the local level as recognition of their contribution to the community. Much of individual Native philanthropic activity is local, usually community-based and disbursed in smaller, less publicly notable denominations and has worth beyond its monetary value.

Similarly, Native leadership and professional associations have not generally focused on philanthropy. The National Indian Gaming Association, National Congress of American Indians, Native American Chamber of Commerce, Native bankers and Native lawyers associations, who could serve as potential sources for donor information and education are usually reluctant to release personal information or membership rosters to protect proprietary interests and the privacy rights of their constituents. It is, therefore, difficult to identify individuals with wealth in the Native community.

Modesty and anonymity are hallmarks of Native cultures. Public coverage of personal or tribal assets may run counter to these beliefs. Within Native communities, affluence or wealth is not necessarily measured by net worth. Particularly in a traditional sense, it is witnessed in human, spiritual and natural terms (children, blessings, songs, healing, etc.). Traditional societies, as one Native grantmaker from California described it, consider a giving person:

one who has dedicated his or her life to the study and preservation of the language and shares that knowledge; a person who conducts himself or herself in a community; and ceremonial leaders. It is more cultural wealth; those types of assets are regarded more significantly than economic wealth; it represents the strength of the community, not an individual economic condition.

In more progressive Native communities, affluence or wealth may be further eroded by measures of relative worth. That is, tribes with commercial assets in natural resources, land settlements, gaming and other areas are communal organizations and, as such, may distribute money to tribal members on a per capita or incentive basis or as dividends. Members, therefore, have a relative worth equal to their standing in the community, a standing sometimes expressed in material assets and power as well as by their ability to affect change.

Regardless of public notoriety, the new wealth has influenced giving in some Native communities. Some tribal members use their money to engage in conspicuous consumption and high lifestyles, while others maintain more conservative lifestyles, but an increasing number are considering formalized gifts. New wealth brings new challenges in all aspects of life including the charitable arena. These challenges emerged at a 1998 gathering of a gaming tribe in the Northeast where a dinner was held to highlight the establishment of a child development center. At the dinner, at which almost a quarter of the tribe was present, each member was asked to bring a book as a donation to the new center. Although the dinner was part of a monthly assembly, this particular event was one of the more well attended. Much of its success involved its underlying message, which required members of this successful tribe, according to one member, “to invest in their future by recreating traditional sharing and giving practices through a giveaway ceremony to help build a foundation of support for the long-term needs of the community.”

Attitudes expressed by those at the dinner were revealing. Many tribal members at the event were unaware of their own charitable options. Although several expressed an interest in learning more about giving in general, and more specifically about tax consequences, charitable vehicles, support networks and advisory assistance; most had limited exposure to these activities. A large

As part of a tribe, individuals whose wealth is communally, or tribally, derived were motivated to give as a way to make a difference and share their good fortune. They gave to health, education, the environment, arts and helping those in need. Their interest in endowments was not individual, however; it was more tribally oriented, like establishing a tribal community foundation or pooled funds.

number of the members of this tribe had been displaced from their traditional roots, some only recently enrolled, others were formerly on public assistance and almost all were “first generation” wealth. Given this mix of awareness and backgrounds, there was understandably guarded curiosity regarding institutionalized giving, possibly more from a lack of exposure than lack of interest. Because their wealth in most cases was new, according to one tribal member, “their giving may be more cautious, incremental and targeted.” Another tribal member noted that, “tribal members must protect their income in case it is taken away.”

Still, charity has its own rewards. A tribal leader noted that, through charitable giving,

individuals can build self-esteem, invest in their own self-sufficiency and make decisions about education, cultural heritage and economic development. Charitable giving is a modern way of giving back to ancestors, to the land and to the spirits.

A tribal elder suggested that the extent and interest in individual giving may be a reflection, “of age, prior economic and social experience, and connection to the community.” Another tribal member noted that giving allows the tribe “to share our abundance as a symbol of our communities’ interdependence and practice our values as Native Americans—kinship, shared responsibilities, respect for the environment and interest in youth, housing, health, elderly, education and economic development issues.”

Money is not the only medium of exchange: Native donors give nonmonetary gifts as well. In-kind contributions are highly valued symbols of support in Indian country. For example, Sam English, a noted Native artist, “dedicated a painting to a benefit for Wilma Mankiller, a former Principal Chief of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma. The picture was printed as a poster whose sale contributed to an endowment at a Foundation. In this case, the donor, Mr. English offered his images to Native causes as a fundraising strategy.”¹¹⁰

Individual vs. Tribal Considerations in Giving

Giving may differ based on whether the donor has derived wealth through tribal or individual means. For example, if the Indian tribe has accumulated wealth through commercial enterprise, particularly gaming, the tribe may be more interested in giving to high-profile, mainstream or national initiatives (National Museum of the American Indian, Special Olympics, Boys and Girls Club, United Way, Red Cross, etc.) to gain public and community approval. A tribal member who has gained personal wealth through the tribe (per capita distributions or salaries) may contribute to more local grassroots, indigenous or community-based efforts but also support

organizations funded by the tribe. An individual (not reservation-based) who has gained wealth through an independent enterprise (not a tribe) may be more interested in national or regional programs or projects that relate to a personal interest or that promote pan-Indian causes or needs.

“Giving is an obligation and part of that responsibility is to the larger community through participation in organized activities and networks such as a state Coordinating Council for Foundations or charitable intermediary groups.”—A donor and member of a gaming tribe

Reservation-Based Individuals

Reservation-based donors show particular traits in their formalized giving. In this study, Native donors who derived their wealth from tribal enterprise supported:

- Tribally sponsored charitable activities such as the United Way, Special Olympics or Native organizations;
- Assorted needs of tribal members, children and elders;
- Educational scholarships; and
- Local sports activities (possibly where their children were involved).

Their giving was relatively new, generally in amounts ranging from \$500 to \$5,000, and if personally involved in a charity or cause, the gift rose from \$25,000 to \$100,000 a year. Personal interest and volunteer participation were key to their giving. One donor, a member of a gaming tribe, noted that “giving is an obligation and part of that responsibility is to the larger community through participation in organized activities and networks such as a state Coordinating Council for Foundations or charitable intermediary groups.” Another donor from the same tribe added that the “obligation to share and participate in giving is a service to the tribe like being on the elders donations committee or tribal council.” This donor further noted that “individual tribal members may serve as readers for state, federal, corporate and foundation projects as well.”

As part of a tribe, individuals whose wealth is communally, or tribally, derived were motivated to give as a way to make a difference and share their good fortune. They gave to health, education, the environment, arts and helping those in need. Their interest in endowments was not individual, however, it was more tribally oriented, like establishing a tribal community foundation or pooled funds.

Nonreservation-Based Individuals

Individuals who derived their wealth independent from a tribe supported:

- Historical and cultural projects;
 - Local university;
 - Human services;
-

Personal history plays a role in giving patterns. Differences in giving may be based on an individuals' socialization—whether they were raised in an urban or reservation setting and their connection to the Native community. Reservation-based individuals may be more focused on local, traditional or tribal concerns. Urban Indians may be broader and more Pan-Indian oriented.

- The arts, such as a museum or artist training;
- Emergency help for those in need; and
- Church and related activities.

These donors volunteered time and committed dollars to church activities, educational institutions and mainstream organizations such as the Cancer Society or the Red Cross. One Native businessman raised on a reservation said that he gave to “a university of his choosing up to \$10,000 per year” to help Native students. Another Native investor (nonreservation-based) indicated that, “he struggled to get off the reservation, worked his way up through school, now he would like to give back to Native people to make a difference.” A tribal college president from the Midwest, who is also an owner of a small business, claimed that,

whether it's veterans or churches or boys and girls clubs, I will generally get a letter asking for donations of whatever I can give, whether it's money, food, goods, products or gift certificates.

Personal history plays a role in giving patterns. Differences in giving may be based on an individual's socialization—whether they were raised in an urban or reservation setting and their connection to the Native community. Reservation-based individuals may be more focused on local, traditional or tribal concerns. Urban Indians may be interested in broader and more Pan-Indian projects.

Regardless of socialization or means of deriving wealth, most individuals in the Native community do not have personal or individual foundations; their gifts are generally informal, response-oriented and sometimes, if large enough, driven by tax incentives. Gifts may also be familial, as a Native donor from North Carolina suggested: “I am interested in building an educational endowment for my grandchildren.” Gifts may also reflect concern for the larger Native community, as was the case with a Native donor from Georgia who gave out of a sense of responsibility to other Native people and decided “to endow a scholarship program at a university for Native students.” Native folk singer Buffy Saint Marie formed a private foundation, the Nihewan Foundation, “as a way to provide opportunities for others through scholarships and other awards. Saint Marie, who gives a percentage of her show business earnings, established the foundation to target needy students in Native communities who have tried to find funds elsewhere but were unable or still in need.”¹¹¹

Individuals may give in different ways over a lifetime. Their giving may evolve from informal to formal as assets grow, interests peak and needs present themselves. The formality of the gift depends on the size, type and pattern of their giving. For example, a noted Native artist from the Southwest initially made periodic gifts upon request and, as he prospered, made more

gifts. With increased frequency and size of gifts, his financial advisor suggested the need for a planned fund. The artist established an advised fund in a local community foundation as a way to organize the gifts into “one check and determine once a year the list of recipients.” Not only did this donor give through the community foundation, he also created a family foundation “to involve his children” and continued to give on an ad hoc informal basis to very personal or urgent causes as well.

Most Native donors in this study eschew the formation of their own private foundations. They believe that it is too time-consuming, they were not aware of the option, no historic precedent exists in Native communities, it is too individually oriented and donors perceived themselves as not having enough wealth to justify the expense.

Most Native donors in this study eschew the formation of their own private foundations. They believe that it is too time-consuming, they were not aware of the option, no historic precedent exists in Native communities, it is too individually oriented and donors perceived themselves as not having enough wealth to justify the expense. Of those who formed private foundations, some did so for tax purposes, others to channel their contributions to a cause or project and still others to protect themselves from personal conflicts. A Native donor from Colorado, who has a family foundation, did so with the support of his spouse. He considered giving as part of “an informal readers group where colleagues will come across a project or organization and enlist his thoughts and interest in the group and vice versa.” Natives of wealth, few in number, are approached by many different people and causes, and thus, tend to remain anonymous and retain a low profile not only to protect themselves from requests, but also as a result of their Native cultural beliefs, which emphasizes modesty and communal interests.

Commonalities among Native and Non-Native Communities

With all these differences, similarities nonetheless exist in giving between Native people and others as well. Paul Schervish, a scholar of philanthropy, suggested that most people are driven to give as a result of such factors as their “community of participation” (the tribe); their framework of consciousness (tradition); mediating organizations or persons who invite participation (tribal leaders, family or Native organizations); the presence of discretionary resources (tribal or personal enterprises); and the existence of a person or experience in one’s youth that inspired giving in adulthood (family or kinship rituals).¹¹² Similar associations might be made with Native individuals, as shown in the parenthetical notations above.

Charitable Giving through Nonprofit Organizations (Tribal, State or Federal Incorporation)

One of the fastest growing areas in Native philanthropy is through nonprofit organizations. Over the years, reservation- and nonreservation-based nonprofit organizations have emerged to provide support for community needs through funds raised initially from the public (state and

federal government) and more recently from tribal and private sources. With the decline of government funding, however, these organizations have increasingly sought private donations, and some have evolved from operating to regranting organizations. Some formed as 501(c)(3) state corporations, others as tribally chartered corporations and some as tribal government agencies under IRC § 7871.¹¹³ Whatever the classification, most are community-, issue- or institutionally based (e.g., Hopi Foundation, Laguna Pueblo Educational Foundation, First Nations Development Institute, Haskell Foundation).

Almost a quarter of the funds in this study have some level of endowment, ranging from \$50,000 to \$6 million. The largest, the American Indian College Fund, is national in scope and relatively mature in organizational development. Most have small staffs, supplemented by volunteers, limited experience in fundraising, particularly private (individual and foundations), and many lack access to other funders. Many are not connected to philanthropic networks such as the Council on Foundations, affinity groups (e.g., Native Americans in Philanthropy (NAP), regional associations of grantmakers (RAGs), support centers or other nonprofit-related organizations.

Most of the organizations interviewed were cause- or issue-related or geographically focused. One fund might support tribal colleges and another economic development and cultural preservation, while another might concentrate on the needs of its community. They share a concept of support that emphasizes human benefits, not simply levels of fundraising. It is clear that differences exist between Native and non-Native nonprofits. A Native foundation official from Oklahoma described these differences this way: “Foundations tend to refer to grantmaking, while Native people talk about the development process.” According to this official, “it may be driven by a culture of reciprocity” as well as a view of philanthropy as part of a continuum of giving and receiving.

Many variations of charitable funds exist in Native communities. They include regranting agencies, service associations, community foundations and tribal foundations as well as workplace or alternative giving programs. They are primarily focused on scholarships, technical assistance, asset development (human, economic, environmental, etc.), cultural preservation and capacity building. Most of the organizations derive their funding from a mix of private foundations, corporations, individuals (Native and non-Native) and tribal entities. A growing number are building their own reserves and reaching out to Native communities for expanded involvement in their fund development.

Whether giving is through regranting, service organizations, community foundations, workplace funds, or tribal foundations and tribal colleges, most of the funds in this study expressed concern about:

- Non-Native donors’ perception of the growing and widespread wealth in Native communities;
 - The limited number of individual donors of wealth in Native communities;
 - The lack of knowledge of planned giving in Indian country from an organizational and donor perspective;
-

- The bridge between Native and non-Native donors; and
- The lack of awareness and access of Native charities to Native and non-Native donors.

In July 1998, many of these concerns were expressed in a focus group meeting where Native grantmakers and grantseekers came together to discuss their interest in and awareness of long-term strategies for endowment building. The meeting, organized by First Nations Development Institute, included 11 Native grantmakers and one nongrantmaking national Native organization. The group, which represented a sampling of funds in Indian country, considered issues such as:

- What it means to achieve financial stability in the Native community;
- Raising support from within the Native community for Native projects;
- The infrastructure needs of charitable funds in Native communities; and
- Strategies and recommendations for the larger foundation community to stimulate the growth of Native funds.

Group members found commonalities as well as differences in their approaches. They found that:

- They all started within the past 30 years, most within the past two decades (1980s);
- Almost all are 501(c)(3) organizations except one that was incorporated under tribal law (§ 7871);
- Most are community-based in their funding, one is statewide and only a few are national in scope;
- They focus on health, youth, elders, environment, arts, education, law and economic development;
- Most derive their support from a combination of governmental and tribal sources, foundations and earned income, and a small, but growing number receive funds from individuals;
- One-third do not have any endowment, and the remaining two-thirds are wide-ranging in their reserves (\$30,000 to \$6.5 million);
- Only one conducted a feasibility study for development needs; and
- Almost all were intended to be grantmaking, but only two-thirds actually provided grants, which ranged from \$1,000 (to assorted health, culture and arts projects), to \$350,000 (scholarships), to \$3.5 million (for tribal colleges).

Whether grantmaker or grantseeker, the group members also identified common challenges, such as:

- Native nonprofits' difficulty in defining their relationship with tribes;
- Their need for infrastructure and capacity-building support; and
- Their role in Native America.

TYPES OF CHARITABLE FUNDS

Regranting Funds

Although many types of regranting funds exist in Indian country, those who serve a broader extra-tribal and diverse constituency are described in this section. These organizations differ depending on their focus (local, national or international), constituency (tribes, individuals or organizations), and interests (arts, education, culture, environment, etc.). Most have grown out of the need to provide a source of culturally relevant and accessible funding for grassroots organizations and for tribes in more remote areas. They usually offer technical assistance to tribes and tribal organizations and serve as incubators of policy and research analyses. Their reach may be national in scope, but many of their grants are reservation-based and locally implemented. Their grantmaking, according to the director of a northeastern fund, is “a tool for more effective asset development and noncategorical and holistic grants that involve lots of site visits over an extended period.” The requirements are “flexible as changes occur in the community,” and they are interactive as “grantees teach them.” For these organizations, philanthropy is not charity, it is a way to foster social change or empower creativity.

These organizations support projects that foster Native self-sufficiency in seed distribution, food preservation, cultivation and growing, as well as growth of assets in the environment, culture and community. They evaluate projects in mostly qualitative rather than in quantitative measurements. According to a Native grantmaker from California, evaluations are not based on “how many families within the community have shelter, are fed and are safe, but on building the spirit of a community, rather than a community itself.”

Many of these organizations derive their funding initially from non-Native sources. Most were formed (directly or indirectly) as a result of a social movement or perceived need (federal or state recognition). Their programs are grassroots and many of their board members and advisors represent Native communities and serve as informal liaisons and project screeners, rather than as fundraisers. In most cases, their board oversees policy, projects and cultural issues. In more recent times, however, board members are increasingly used in fundraising and capacity-building efforts.

Some of these organizations are structured, as one Native funder stated, so “that everybody gets the same benefit, everybody is going to get a poster whether they give \$12 or \$12,000. There is no preference, bigger and better awards for bigger and better gifts.” They are also not limited to supporting nonprofits. Some provide support for individuals through fellowships and scholarships as well. This is due, according to a Native funder from Montana, to the fact that “people make change; we invest in change for the betterment of the people.”

Following are examples of two organizations that regrant funds:

- **First Nations Development Institute**, which began in 1980, promotes local economic development in Native communities through grants, loans and technical assistance by building on cultural values and addressing community needs through self-determination.
-

Since 1994, the Institute, through its Eagle Staff Fund, awarded 126 grants, totalling \$5.7 million, and initiated a number of donor advised funds.

- **Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development**, which begun in 1984, is an intermediary foundation dedicated to promoting and maintaining the uniqueness of Native peoples and nations. It offers training, grants, management support and technical assistance to Native community-based projects nationwide. The fund seeks to educate the general public about indigenous peoples and to help build sustainable communities. The endowment, established nine years ago, has risen to more than \$360,000.

Tribally Based Foundations

Tribally based foundations are growing in number and variety. They range in size, endowment potential, structure and tax designation. Of those interviewed, most were:

- Section 501 (c)(3) organizations (save two);
- Community-based;
- Single constituency oriented;
- Established within the past decade (save three);
- Focused on tribal or community issues; and
- Increasingly more reliant on tribal and private funds as opposed to state and federal government sources.

The emergence of tribal grantmaking foundations is a relatively new phenomenon. Many were established as separate tribal entities, free of control by tribal government to avoid political conflicts. Over time, they adapted new ways to be more culturally and structurally appropriate in governance and program delivery.

Most were developed with tribal support and community involvement. Their formation may have been influenced by a particular community need or funding gap such as scholarships, community development projects or cultural or language preservation efforts. Much of their initial development focused on leveraging external support, possibly funds not provided by government or tribally supported programs. Most have only limited experience in fundraising and less in grantmaking. They all seem to have an interest in endowments but also recognize their lack of infrastructure capacity and technical expertise to administer and maintain an endowment.

One tribe in New Mexico started a foundation under the tribal government but after careful consideration shifted its operations to another department (within the tribe) to de-politicize its activities. Following the move, the tribe, less hindered by political considerations, donated \$3 million in royalties and interest from commercial investments. To sustain the foundation, according to its director, “a board was put in place that could help to garner money and contacts outside the community.” A year after its inception, the foundation faced numerous challenges in leveraging funds, possibly as a result of the lack of understanding and awareness of the foundation by its leaders and members, and of insufficient board involvement. Because the concept and structure of the foundation were new, according to its director, this tribe and its foundation

The oldest of the tribally based foundations interviewed, located in Oklahoma, started as an Upward Bound program of the tribe, with volunteer staff, shared resources with tribal government and a board of tribal members. The program evolved into a foundation whose interests include cultural projects (preservation of language, arts and crafts, cultural rituals, cultural center, building restoration, etc.) and infrastructure needs.

board “will need nurturing and education on the foundation’s role and importance to the community.”

Another tribal foundation officer in Arizona noted that money and contacts are not the only challenges: “as success of their foundation grew, so too did the number of community requests for assistance.” To carry out its mission, the foundation had to serve its villages through project partnerships and collaborations with other Native and non-Native grantmakers. They used volunteers and community members to complete projects.

The oldest of the tribally based foundations interviewed, located in Oklahoma, started as an Upward Bound program of the tribe, with volunteer staff, shared resources with tribal government and a board of tribal members. The program evolved into a foundation whose interests include cultural projects (preservation of language, arts and crafts, cultural rituals, cultural center, building restoration, etc.) and infrastructure needs. For this foundation, the staff work closely with the tribe to determine the programs and projects that respond to the needs of the people (education, preventative health and welfare programs). With increased ownership and oversight, one tribal foundation official observed that, “Tribal members were more likely to contribute.” As a separate 501(c)(3) foundation, their initial support was derived from the tribe, but ongoing efforts to raise money increasingly focus on the community and other private sources.

Another tribal foundation in Oklahoma carries out its mission with a more traditional focus on agriculture, restoring plant roots and seeds of corn and empowering tribal systems. The foundation bases its mission on the idea that, according to an official of the foundation, “solutions for modern problems are found in indigenous traditions and lifeways and in the development of strategies that mirror these beliefs.” This foundation reaps success by its support of community-based projects initiated by the people to meet their needs. Much of its funding comes from private foundations and individuals. Although it is not formally part of the tribe—it is a separate 501(c)(3) organization—the foundation works closely with tribal members to develop its projects and access resources (in-kind and intellectual) to fulfill its development needs.

Tribally based foundations are receiving more and more support from their communities. In New Mexico, for example, the Zuni Pueblo, a traditional tribe, surveyed members about their needs and interests and asked: “Is it a good idea to start a [tribal] foundation?” Surprisingly, more than 90 percent responded favorably and said they would support a foundation by giving \$5 a year.¹¹⁴ These responses indicated that tribal members trusted community activities and supported the potential impact of a foundation on the general community welfare. Many in this

community may have been influenced by charitable organizations such as United Ways and clubs and may have associated them favorably with foundations.

Although tribal foundations are becoming more popular, their success depends to a large degree on support from the tribe and its members. When a foundation is part of a tribal/state compact or legislative compromise, members may not be as supportive of their foundation arrangement. The desire for independence runs deep and strong in Indian country, and the prospect of formal arrangements with other governments is often met with suspicion. Memories of relationships gone sour are strong and fresh. A tribe in Oregon, for example, as part of their gaming compact, was required to contribute a percentage of their gaming profits each year to their foundation. This arrangement concerned the tribal leadership, not only because of a perceived infringement on sovereignty, but also because of the tribe's strong history of contributions to community projects. Previously, they funded educational scholarships for local high school students and supported economic development projects in the town. Although their foundation structure (i.e., governing board) was determined by compact (e.g., three members from the tribal board, one member from the corporate board, three members chosen by the tribe from the community and one member appointed by the governor), decisionmaking was Native-driven, using a consensus style process. Of the \$387,831 in initial grants from the foundation, all 37 went to organizations in seven counties, primarily to youth, family, education and arts, mainly for non-Native projects.¹¹⁵ The tribe gives an additional 33 percent of their total revenue slated for charitable contributions directly to community organizations. To reflect the interests of the community and the tribe, the foundation's mission focuses on "the promotion of education, to help students from the smallest grade to doctoral level and those who did not attain their GED, and to provide support for family and youth programs and services."¹¹⁶ And their motto, according to the tribal chair is, "Together we have come a long way from the 'Trail of Tears,' and 'Together We Soar.'"¹¹⁷ For this tribe, they chose to incorporate under tribal law rather than state or federal law (i.e., 501(c)(3)). The tribe also became involved in a local funders network and more active with other foundations in the area as a result of their foundation.

In general, tribally based foundations have grown steadily over the past few years, but their grantmaking capacity is highly dependent on tribal support (moral and monetary) as well as partnerships and other funding sources. They are driven by the needs of the community, which also drives their grantmaking. Their collective experiences point to the need for community support, but to gain such support, Native foundations must build successful track records, establish name recognition and connect to the community and respond to its needs. In addition, the use of board members as fundraisers and community liaisons is critical to leveraging external and internal support.

Tribal Colleges¹¹⁸

Tribal colleges house another form of tribally based grantmaker. Most provide scholarships and technical assistance. Some have endowments similar to mainstream universities in structure, but not size, and lack adequate fundraising capabilities to satisfy their development needs.¹¹⁹ Of the 30 tribal colleges in the United States, very few are economically stable, 18 have gaming on their

reservations, and fewer (five) received a share of their gaming profits. Some of the more successful tribes, such as the Menominee of Wisconsin, contributed more than \$2 million to establish their college, the College of the Menominee Nation, which is only a small portion of the resources needed to start an institution of higher education.¹²⁰

Tribal college foundations are growing in number. According to an informal survey of tribal colleges conducted during the 1998 American Indian Higher Education Consortium annual meeting, nine tribal colleges have foundations.¹²¹ With various levels of endowments and grantmaking programs, these colleges represent one facet of a growing interest in and potential for permanent funds to build infrastructure, offer scholarships and provide for more long-term needs of these institutions. They generally raise money and make grants to their own institution for its needs.¹²²

Community Foundation Funds

As of August 1998, at least 16 community foundations, with 33 individual funds, hold Native-initiated or controlled advised or focused funds.¹²³ Several others have been approached by, or are in, negotiations with Native communities. The Tucson Community Foundation, New London Community Foundation, Rhode Island Community Foundation, and possibly others have identified Native-American populations in the changing demographics of their communities and have either sought contacts in these communities or were contacted for assistance in managing scholarships or advised funds.

Each of the following funds were established with a slight variation in design, governance and source to reflect their unique regional and cultural practices:

- In Montana, a tribe was invited to establish an advised fund as part of a community foundation outreach initiative;
 - In New Mexico, a local Native-American artist set up an advised fund, and was encouraged to do so not only for tax purposes, but also for ease in administering charitable contributions;
 - A fund in Minnesota evolved from a broader mission of diversity. This fund, controlled and advised by a committee of Native-American community leaders, focuses on cultural preservation, education, children and elders. It makes grants up to \$3,500 and provides technical assistance up to \$1,500. Armed with a culturally relevant motto, "We Care and We Share," the fund is a designated endowment of the community foundation. In its first year, the fund awarded \$75,000, in its second year, \$142,000 in 40 grants; and in its third cycle (1998), \$74,000 in 20 grants;¹²⁴
 - In the Duluth-Superior area of Minnesota, the Anishinabe Fund was established within the community foundation to foster cultural awareness of the Anishinabe/Ojibwe artistic, spiritual and domestic traditions and objects both historic and contemporary. The fund provides grants between \$300 and \$1,000 for projects located in seven counties of Minnesota and Wisconsin to promote the spiritual values, legends, exhibits and ceremo-
-

...some tribal officials expressed reluctance to ask for charitable contributions from their members, their tribe or the local indigenous business community because “it is seen as aggressive and impolite.” There may also be a lack of monetary resources in the community or possibly a negative experience with money management programs. Some Native communities tend to be more informal in their business practices and respond to more relaxed timetables and commitments.

nial teachings of the Anishinabe/Ojibwe culture through schools, media, published collections or other means of transmission;¹²⁵

- In North Carolina, eight funds were established by one tribe in a local community foundation. With a collective value of \$280,000 the endowment has made small grants to help build a bridge to a restored green space, to fund a kidney dialysis unit and to establish a traditional garden and picnic area in the local nursing home. Because of the tribe’s interest in education and elders, scholarship and cemetery funds were established for their members. One of the most successful funds was developed by a local Native businessman to protect and restore a historical cemetery that reflects the value Native people place on honoring the spirits of their ancestors. Most of these funds were initiated prior to the establishment of the tribe’s casino. With the casino, the tribe may accelerate their giving to other long-term investments in education and community rebuilding.¹²⁶ The tribe has allocated a limited amount of funds to the endowment, and with each new tribal council elected every two years, council members are informed of the endowment funds and the importance of building reserves for the future.¹²⁷

For some community foundations, inherent challenges arise in their partnerships with Indian tribes, growing, in part, from differences in culture and communications. For example, some tribal officials expressed reluctance to ask for charitable contributions from their members, their tribe or the local indigenous business community because “it is seen as aggressive and impolite.” There may also be a lack of monetary resources in the community or possibly a negative experience with money management programs. Some Native communities tend to be more informal in their business practices and respond to more relaxed timetables and commitments. Most tribes have not had a history of institutional philanthropy and have a hard time supporting the concept of long-term endowments when confronted with the current needs of their friends and neighbors. In all, the community foundation funds represented in this report face similar challenges. They rely on limited resources, small contributions, tribal support (or family involvement) and a mix of Native and non-Native donations.

Most of the funds in community foundations represented in this report were established in the past decade. Some are an outgrowth of foundation initiatives (notably, the Ford Foundation Diversity Initiative), others respond to local economic changes (gaming enterprises) or personal contacts (board members’ connection). They range in size, purpose and structure, but they are all Native-controlled and oriented. They generally support scholarships and cultural projects, draw on a mix of Native and non-Native funding sources, are endowed with small contributions of \$1 to \$5,000 and are supported by a tribe or, if individually initiated, by a family.

Native-American Service Organizations

A growing number of Native-American service organizations provide, among other services, grants to their members or constituent groups. Some are professional associations and others are service oriented, but an increasing number are making grants for scholarships or projects and

Some Native organizations even avoid requests for general support from the Native community because, as one Native service organization leader from Colorado said, “we don’t ask for money for endowments from Indian people [particularly in traditional societies] because that’s totally against everyday practices of what’s here and now,” or “what is necessary for subsistence.”

embracing endowments as a way to institutionalize and sustain themselves. These groups may vary in constituency but not in their interest to support the needs in Indian country. They include such groups as the American Indian College Fund, American Indian Science and Engineering Society, Council for Energy Resource Tribes, Native American Journalists Association and the United Indian Traders Association, among others. One example of a recent gift from the United Indian Traders Association, a network comprised of Indian trading post owners from the Southwest, was an endowed scholarship fund of \$250,000 at Northern Arizona University for students from parts of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah.¹²⁸

Some organizations are facing increasing pressure from mainstream foundations to solicit from Indian tribes and others in their own community. In these cases, some believe that foundations may be applying a formula for grassroots support that does not readily suit this population because of the limited number of tribes with wealth, fewer with giving histories outside tribal boundaries and a corresponding boundless list of needs. In response, as one Native organization leader put it, “Indian tribes are not ready-made grantmakers.” They are “sovereign nations” and “not in the business of nongovernmental, extra-tribal grantmaking.” Many Native Americans have wrestled with requests for support from their own community. Some Native organizations even avoid requests for general support from the Native community because, as one Native service organization leader from Colorado said, “we don’t ask for money for endowments from Indian people [particularly in traditional societies] because that’s totally against everyday practices of what’s here and now” or “what is necessary for subsistence.”

Workplace or Alternative Giving Funds

Workplace giving is not new. In fact, Native Americans have contributed through payroll deduction programs for quite some time through America’s Charities, the Combined Federal Campaign and United Ways. Native United Ways and tribal vendor programs are, however, emerging as viable alternatives to mainstream workplace giving programs. The emergence of such vehicles may be attributable to reasons expressed in a recent statewide survey of United Ways in California (where a large percentage of Native Americans reside) in which a majority of American Indians declared that:

- Native Americans are not being asked to give; and
- United Ways and other federated funds are not supporting charities in Native communities.

In addition, the survey demonstrated that:

- The younger age group (18 to 34 years old) are less aware of United Way than older Indians (45 to 64 years old);
- More (70 percent vs. 64 percent) non-United Way Native donors volunteered than those who contributed to United Ways;
- Most Native people (95 percent) respond to direct emergency assistance, helping children, the disabled and the elderly;
- Many Native donors prefer that their gift be used for the greatest need, not just in their community;
- More than three-quarters of Native donors want to be recognized only by receiving information about how money is spent, rather than public identification (listed in newsletter or an award ceremony); and
- Almost 90 percent of the Native donors give as a result of their belief in a cause and a majority want to see results from their gift in order to stimulate more support.¹²⁹

These results indicate a consistent message in Indian country: Native people respond to urgent needs, local causes and are results oriented.

Tribal United Ways

Other vehicles through which Native people give include not only traditional workplace United Ways and Combined Federal Campaigns but also tribally oriented workplace programs. One such program, a recent outgrowth of the United Way, is its tribal affiliate, Navajo Way. Thus far, only one tribe has formally affiliated and another, Cherokee Way, began on its own with only limited success. Navajo Way is structured similar to other United Ways, except that it is also conceived as a vehicle for corporate, foundation and individual support through grants and personal contributions. Since the mid-1980s, Navajo people and businesses have contributed to Navajo Way to provide funding, technical assistance and development for nonprofit organizations that serve their reservation. Unlike other United Ways, however, Navajo Way responds to community needs and requests in culturally appropriate ways. For example, grants are ongoing, giving is not limited to workplace contributions because there are limited numbers of employers in the area and giving is more familial, social, results-oriented and based on personal referrals. Navajo Way uses technology—it maintains a Web site on the Internet—to help build community, and allow its members on-line access to donors and grantees.

Much of Navajo Way's focus is on traditions and practices of the Navajo's—"The Navajo Way," a lifeway based on the four directions—east, west, south and north. The Navajo Way of living is a process of personal development that begins in the East, travels South with degrees of maturity, ages in the West and ends in the North with seniority and wisdom. It is in the West

that the tradition of giving takes form, achieving a certain level of maturity and responsibility that enables an individual to think beyond his or her own world to consider others. Navajo Way as a giving and grantmaking vehicle is governed by Native people and operated through committees and consensus. Navajo Way works in partnership with other non-Native United Ways in neighboring areas to reach tribal members and nonprofits beyond its immediate service area. It is a generally accepted way to solicit funds because, as one Navajo official stated: “Native people in this community distinguish charity from foundation work. They consider workplace giving to be charitable and foundation giving a business activity geared more toward the wealthy.”

Other Alternative Programs

Indian tribes are embracing workplace giving in a number of ways. They seek donations from employees of tribal enterprises, business vendors and tribal governments. One example of a unique workplace giving program, initiated by a Southwest tribe, involves a multipronged approach of employee contributions from different employers—tribal government, tribal enterprise and the larger business community (particularly tribal vendors). Under this program, creatively termed “Change for a Dollar,” each employer uses a payroll deduction of \$1 per employee per week to be channelled into the tribe’s foundation for charitable distributions.

CHARITABLE GIVING THROUGH INDIAN TRIBAL ACTIVITIES

On a tribal level, several vehicles are employed for giving—sometimes simultaneously. Tribes give through their government (e.g., the tribal council, the council of elders, the business council); their enterprise (e.g., charitable giving committees, the board and marketing offices); tribal foundations; and intertribal organizations (e.g., a network of local tribal leaders). Most of these activities are unstructured; reflect the values of the particular council, board or collective; and are responsive to tribal members’ needs or political concerns—both internal and external. A tribal Council, for example, might make decisions based on the internal interests of their community (tribe), while the tribal enterprise might give to broader cultural and community projects, and the elders council might support projects or causes of personal interest of the council’s members or kin.

Alaska Native regional corporations, however, are somewhat different.¹³⁰ They often form foundations as conduits for local funding, and use their corporate arms for support to the larger community, the region or elsewhere. One Alaska Native foundation, for example, offers scholarships and support for community projects with a grant program of \$260,000 per year to reach out to its 15,000 enrolled members, and funds other projects outside the community through marketing operations for social investment or business development purposes.¹³¹

Tribes in a position to contribute (charitable and political donations) on a large scale, between \$100,000 and \$10 million, typically use different vehicles for different types of gifts. For example, their gaming enterprise may give larger sums to national or international organizations,

while their elders council gives in smaller denominations to causes or projects of personal interest, and their tribal council may donate a variety of gifts (small to mid-range) to community interests.

Tribal giving is often ad hoc and spontaneous, except when managed by tribal foundations. One of the primary reasons for this is that as nations, Indian tribes are responsible for the welfare of their people and the condition of their territory. As such, they must serve the needs of their members before considering the needs of others. They are not in the business of charitable giving; they are governmentally oriented. In addition, as a former Native-American service organization leader put it, tribes are like states and, “to expect the Shakopee Mdewakanton of Minnesota to support the Blackfeet Community College would be akin to asking New York to share its gaming revenues with Hawai’i. One cannot hold sovereign Indian governments to different standards than one holds state governments.”¹³² According to a tribal member from Minnesota, tribes are also limited by “governmental decisionmaking processes, a process with many checks and balances, and are responsive to a multitude of interests.”¹³³

Indian tribal giving is a fluid process. Because of the newness of formalized giving, it is usually driven by leadership and economics. Leadership and economics guide philanthropic interests as exemplified by a tribe in Minnesota that experienced shifting policies as, “they began with gifts to rebuild their infrastructure (Head Start, school buses, a health clinic, a community center, water and sewer lines) and evolved to gifts for Indian and non-Indian projects outside the tribe (radio stations, a humane society, religious institutions, boys and girls clubs, a Lions club, local schools, hospitals, police departments, chambers of commerce, etc.).” This change reflected their rising level of assets, changes in leadership and diminishing needs in their community.

In general, tribes tend to give internally to education, health and services that benefit their members; while gifts outside of the community tend to be more political and community-relations oriented—as one tribal member from Wisconsin put it, external gifts are for “big-splash, arts and entertainment events.”

Tribal Enterprise Giving¹³⁴

Tribal enterprise giving is similar to mainstream corporate giving.¹³⁵ That is, it may be driven by nonbusiness-related, political or market concerns. Nonbusiness-related gifts are driven by personal interests, such as a tribal member whose child is on a local sports team. Tribes may also give for political purposes by making donations to candidates for public office or to Native and non-Native nonprofits that combat legal or legislative inequities. In some cases, tribal enterprises are motivated by short- or long-term profit motives or the need to enhance their commercial image, and—like their counterparts in the mainstream corporate world—their giving may advance business goals. For instance, tribes may offer gift certificates or sponsor events for charitable causes as a way to publicize the use of their casinos.

Compared with mainstream corporations, Indian tribal enterprises are still in their initial phase of institutional philanthropy, where their giving is somewhat modest (relative to its potential), unstructured and idiosyncratic. Similar to their mainstream corporate counterparts, it

will take some time for Indian tribes to develop charitable contribution plans that parallel the rest of their business strategies.¹³⁶ Indian tribes are only beginning to forge partnerships with nonprofit organizations and offer matching gifts. They are providing an increasing number of in-kind gifts, as well as event sponsorships. Although tribes and Native individuals are finding new ways to give, only a few Indian tribes and individuals are currently in the position to be large-scale donors.

Indian tribes are only beginning to forge partnerships with nonprofit organizations and to offer matching gifts. They are providing an increasing number of in-kind gifts, as well as event sponsorships. Although tribes and Native individuals are forging new ways to give, only a few Indian tribes are currently in the position to be large-scale donors or to support their own external political activities.

Of the tribes that are in a position to give and use creative mechanisms, most fund a diverse portfolio of projects and programs. For one Indian tribe in Wisconsin, a primary consideration for their giving is the number of enrolled members who may be positively affected by the donation. Their giving program, which began in the 1980s, allows them to consider the needs of their members and the welfare and education of their community. Their tribal government budget allocates cash as well as in-kind contributions for such needs as printing and advertising costs for charitable projects and events. With an average annual contribution of \$1.5 million, the tribe supports community-based organizations (Salvation Army, homeless shelters, family services, urban Indian centers, etc.); tribally oriented groups (National Congress of American Indians, National Indian Gaming Association, Native American Rights Funds, etc.); international organizations (Chiapas); political organizations (Democratic National Committee, Republican National Committee); and numerous individual candidates and issues. In this community, giving—originally perceived as a way to support organizations that serve tribal members—in the aftermath of gaming, has become, in part, a way to enhance the tribe's visibility and image in the community. The tribe encourages its employees, through flexible work schedules, to contribute to fundraising events. Despite many years of giving, philanthropy has not been readily accepted in their membership. Some members feel that their needs should "take priority over others" and "that a foundation allows monies to flow out of the community to needs not linked to the membership."

An Indian tribe in New York, whose successful casino helped create more than 220 businesses, gives generously to a wide range of community projects, including an \$8 million donation to bring water lines from the city to a joint town water system, \$450,000 to the school district and \$300,000 in general support to the town. The tribe also awarded educational scholarships and job training and participated in local volunteer activities.¹³⁷

Fearing an economic downturn in gaming, some Indian tribes have also sought creative ways to fund community services, including combining or matching gaming profits with grants from the federal or state government, such as the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban

Development for housing, grants for healthcare facilities from the Indian Health Service or Enterprise scholarships from the U.S. Department of Education to allow young people to attend college.¹³⁸

A broader, more national view of tribal philanthropy is not uncommon when circumstances are appropriate and resources permit. One such example of a broader charitable offer than those mentioned above came from a tribe in Idaho, the Coeur d'Alene, which offered tribes without gaming enterprises a 5 percent share of the gross revenues from a proposed National Indian Lottery.¹³⁹

Tribal enterprise gifts reflect a wide range of interests and issues, both political and charitable. Following is a snapshot of small and large gifts of tribes across the United States, by issue:

- **Education, particularly scholarships and fellowships:**
 - Prairie Island Indian Community of Minnesota gave \$100,000 to Augsburg College to establish an American Indian Support program;
 - Coeur d'Alene gave \$240,000 to tribal and public schools;
 - Cabazon Band of Mission Indians gave \$10,000 to the University of California-Riverside for American Indian scholarships;
 - Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde of Oregon gave \$900,000 to their tribal foundation, the Spirit Mountain Community Fund, to endow a congressional fellowship to send an American Indian to Washington, D.C., to work on issues that affect American Indians;¹⁴⁰ and
 - Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians donated \$5,000 to the University of Detroit's Mercy Indian Law Center for research on tribal legal issues.
- **Urban Indian affairs:**
 - Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community gave \$275,000 to the Division of Indian Works to fund housing for the American Indian population in greater Minneapolis.
- **Youth and elderly:**
 - The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation in Oregon created a childcare facility, senior citizen program, an elders group and an elders investment fund.
 - Tulalip Tribes of Washington State donated a 20,000 square foot facility for the Boys and Girls Club.
- **Rehabilitation services:**
 - The Tulalip Tribes of Washington State donated \$100,000 to a nonprofit gambling addiction organization.¹⁴¹

- **Natural Resources:**

- Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation in Nespelem, Washington, donated \$20,000 to prevent starvation of the deer population during the winter months in the Moses Columbia Basin.

- **Arts:**

- Tribes with gaming enterprises near San Diego, California, gave more than \$200,000 to the local symphony in 1997.¹⁴²
 - Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, a Cahuilla Tribe near Indio, California, contributed \$25,000 toward the creation of a mural in downtown Indio to depict the lives of their ancestors.¹⁴³
 - Cow Creek/Seven Feathers Foundation gave \$9,700 to a museum historical society for maintenance, printing and displays.

Some are more political in nature:

- **State and county projects:**

- Muckleshoot Tribe of Washington State gave \$300,000 to law enforcement and local government projects; and
 - Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan gave \$7.6 million to governmental interests in the state to fund roads, schools, fire and mental health services.

- **National policy and legislative groups:**

- Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation gave \$1 million to the Native American Rights Fund (NARF);
 - Prairie Island Indian Community gave \$200,000 to the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI);¹⁴⁴
 - Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma gave \$100,000 to the Democratic National Committee (DNC); and
 - Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians gave more than \$4 million to various groups to protect their sovereignty.

These examples represent only a small percentage of the overall Indian tribal donations that occur each day in Indian country. Tribes such as those in Arizona, California, Connecticut, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Washington and others have reinvested their enterprise revenues into community improvement with new schools, scholarship programs, housing, elderly services and healthcare facilities as well as governmental responsibilities such as roads, sewers, fire and police protections.¹⁴⁵ Three California tribes—Barona, Sycuan and Viejas—follow their “Kumeyaay” Indian tradition by giving back to the larger community. They fund the arts, youth, elderly, health and religious groups as well as national organizations such as the Red Cross, Cancer Society, Heart Association, Kiwanis Clubs, Boys and Girls Clubs and a few Native-oriented programs such as the basket weavers and craft displays.¹⁴⁶

Some tribes may also respond to unsolicited causes. For example, the Morongo Band of Mission Indians continues a tradition that began centuries ago with the Pilgrims, “to honor the spirit of the original Thanksgiving with a donation” of 250 turkeys and \$10,000 for meals for Los Angeles families in need.¹⁴⁷ They also donated \$20,000 to the families of two Riverside County sheriff’s deputies shot to death in a sniper attack.¹⁴⁸

A number of Indian tribes sponsor golf tournaments and other sports events, host fundraisers (dinners and art exhibitions) and collaborate with other Native and non-Native organizations for specific causes. Tribes with gaming enterprises make charitable contributions of gift certificates and prizes, food and hotel space. A recent example of an innovative tribal charitable venture was in Louisiana at the Grand Casino Avoyelles, operated by the Tunica-Biloxi Indians, where the tribe “recognized outstanding community groups in Louisiana through an awards ceremony.” According to the tribal chairman, the awards highlighted the importance of education as a vehicle to success. The tribe saw “business and industry’s need for trained and educated workers” and provided support to groups advancing those ideals. The Tunica-Biloxi Indians gave more than \$308,000 through their donations program.¹⁴⁹

Whatever the gift, differing values and motivations influence donations. Tribal enterprises, as one Native scholar noted, “serve as good corporate citizens, giving generously to charitable causes in surrounding non-Indian communities.”¹⁵⁰

Tribal Government Giving

There are many facets to tribal government giving, be they the business, elders or tribal councils, or economic development or public relations offices. Of all the many ways Indian tribes give through their tribal government much of it is dependent on leadership, community interest and support, and awareness of the intrinsic benefit of the gift to its members. As nations, Indian tribes sometimes consider familial needs, as a former tribal giving official from Minnesota described, “Tribal Council giving is very informal, they take care of families first, then tribal needs.” Beyond family, a member of a northeastern tribe further explained that “the tribe must first consider building its infrastructure, schools, cultural centers and health clinics,” before the needs of its neighbors.

Sometimes the business council of a tribe oversees donations, other times the elders approve gifts, and in some cases, the tribal council approves both corporate and tribal charitable contributions. If, for example, a tribal chief, governor or chairperson is inclined toward philanthropy, the tribe is more likely to participate. The decision to give may, however, cause conflict among families and between government and enterprise interests. Such conflicts characterized the struggle of a tribe in the Midwest as their grants process evolved from a highly organized system with monthly grant review meetings (15 to 20 grant requests per month) to ad hoc tribally controlled decisions for gifts of personal leadership interest. For this tribe, their leadership was in transition and charitable contributions were part of the power dynamics of the controlling parties.

Tribal councils often rely on planning and economic development officials for advice on

local and national grants. For more progressive tribes, grants are often made for “charitable investment” purposes. That is, the tribe will consider a project for its long-term or strategic benefits. For example, a tribe may fund a cultural center, waste facility, or sports facility for dual-use for local residents as well as for tribal members.

In all, much of tribal government giving, according to a respected Native advisor from California, is for humanitarian interests and “Indian tribal governments give with a little more heart because they must be accountable to their people.”

In all, much of tribal government giving, according to a respected Native advisor from California, is for humanitarian interests and “Indian tribal governments give with a little more heart because they must be accountable to their people.”

Intertribal Consortia

Giving through intertribal consortia is somewhat new, and growing in popularity, particularly in areas with a large tribal presence and a concentration of wealth through gaming or other commercial enterprises. As collective networks, intertribal consortia may be fraught with politics and competing community interests. They often begin with Native support—financial and organizational—and expand to non-Native financial support. They are usually service-oriented; focus on youth, elderly or human services; depend on tribal leadership for support and resources; have boards comprised of tribal leaders, each with their own interests and constituencies; and are part of larger intertribal programs. An example of such an intertribal foundation which represents the nation’s first such entity is the Michigan Native American Foundation. A catalyst for Michigan Native communities, the foundation helps to develop innovative programs for local youth and elders, spark leadership development and distribute funds to tribes and Native organizations in the Sault Saint Maria area. As part of a matching grant initiative, the W. K. Kellogg Foundation three years ago challenged the Intertribal Council of Michigan to raise funds for an endowment. Seven tribal governments initially joined to meet the match, and three more rose to the challenge by 1998. Operating without a full-time staff, the foundation has built a modest endowment, allowing for only nominal grants for special needs.¹⁵¹

Alaska Native Foundations

The Alaska Native Foundations in this study were all associated with regional corporations.¹⁵² Most began as an outgrowth of their regional corporate sponsor’s interest, through shareholder support and commitment to enhanced community involvement. For the most part, these foundations were formed with annual allocations from their corporate sponsors and eventually grew with larger donations for endowments. Although relatively new, institutional philanthropy among Alaska Natives had previously existed through individual contributions to local charities and mainstream groups for human services. These models served as the basis for the

Some Alaska Native regional corporations not only support a separate foundation, but they also have their own organizational giving programs. They usually focus on broader community activities such as gifts to a Native Heritage Center, Boy Scouts, Salvation Army and others. They offer in-kind contributions to charitable events as well as encourage other charitable opportunities for their members.

foundation's initial focus on health and social services. As awareness of the foundation and its potential grew, emphasis expanded to cultural preservation, education and environmental protections. Although these foundations began with tribal support, most were intended to serve as a vehicle to attract external funding for their community programs. Over time, foundation officials realized that external sources were not readily accessible in some of the more remote areas. Funds continued to be raised from their regional corporate sponsors, and giving continued to reflect the perceived interests of the shareholders in the villages and communities.

In one Alaska Native community, a foundation was formed under the tribe's corporate bylaws. The bylaws were a product of the 1971 Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, where village or regional corporations are required to consider the social welfare of their members.¹⁵³ With an initial allocation of \$500,000 from the corporation, this particular foundation began by offering scholarships for enrolled members in the region to attend college or attain vocational skills. Shortly after the foundation's inception, the corporate board authorized a professional shareholder opinion survey to test support for the foundation. Among other questions, the survey asked shareholders, "How do you rank the foundation?" Out of 21 options, survey respondents ranked the foundation "number one" in effectiveness and importance. Said one shareholder, "they equate the foundation with education and survival." As a result of the survey, the corporate board pledged a three-year annual gift of \$500,000, with an eventual appropriation of \$5 million toward an endowment. Between 1987 and 1997, the foundation endowment grew from \$500,000 to \$10 million, which led the corporate leadership to raise its goal to \$20 million. According to a foundation officer, this success resulted from the perception that the "foundation raised the corporation's image and supported the community."

Some Alaska Native regional corporations not only support a separate foundation, but they also have their own organizational giving programs. They usually focus on broader community activities such as gifts to a Native Heritage Center, Boy Scouts, Salvation Army and others. They offer in-kind contributions to charitable events as well as encourage other charitable opportunities for their members. Success of these corporations also benefits their shareholders. As shareholders, some Alaska Natives have written wills to protect their assets, some have offered corporate stock as part of their charitable contributions and others have started their own businesses with their dividend payments.¹⁵⁴ Use of more sophisticated philanthropic instruments and techniques is emerging in these communities: One Alaska Native foundation officer claimed that "planned giving is becoming a reality with more wills and stocks offered to the foundation."

EMERGING FORMS OF NATIVE-AMERICAN CHARITABLE GIVING

Evidence shows increasing interest in and use of creative ways to give in Indian country allowing for greater effectiveness and durability. Examples of these techniques include:

- Formation of partnerships with other Native and non-Native entities, as a means of achieving self-sufficiency and self-determination as well as leveraging human and financial resources;
- Establishment of tribal foundations, designated through tribal law (IRC § 7871), as a way for Native people to protect their sovereignty and independence and contribute to services and infrastructure needs; and
- Development of tribal community foundations as a way for individuals to participate in community development (lifeways, environment, housing, etc.).

The subject of endowments raises several key conflicts inherent in the different lifeways or views of Native and non-Natives. Such views as: “We live for here and now. We don’t know how long the money will be around”... “We must share with the generation to come or seventh generation.” ... “indigenous people always had endowments either in the form of crops that they grew, or harvesting animals like the buffalo for the next season.”

The common thread that flows through these developments is a greater understanding of institutional philanthropy and its adaptation to Native needs. These developments may provide better access and draw more charitable dollars from a larger pool of individuals and Indian tribes. By adopting new ways of giving, Indian tribes are creating more culturally appropriate giving models in their governance, structure and program delivery. These new approaches, according to a tribal member from the Northwest, may differ from mainstream foundation giving, which is “hierarchical, linear and formal.”

ENDOWMENT BUILDING AMONG NATIVE-AMERICAN COMMUNITIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

The subject of endowments raises several key conflicts inherent in the different ways of life or views of Native and non-Natives. Such views as: “We live for here and now. We don’t know how long the money will be around.” Or, “We must share with the generation to come or seventh generation.” One Native service organization leader from Colorado offered another consideration, “indigenous people always had endowments either in the form of crops that they grew, or harvesting animals like the buffalo for the next season.” These conflicts may be the result of balancing boom-and-bust cycles, legal shifts and political changes that cause insecurities and survival lifestyles.

Notwithstanding the volatilities in economic and political conditions, however, interest in endowment building is increasing in Native communities as more donors and nonprofits

consider its potential. Native nonprofits confront obstacles in building infrastructure and in managing and sustaining endowments, while Native donors are reluctant to contribute without building confidence and trust in the long-term institutional possibilities of the organization.

Native donors and nonprofits also recognize that most charitable funds in Native communities have not reached the threshold for endowment building. That is, they lack adequate staff support, expertise (financial and investment plans), organizational maturity and broad donor involvement. As expressed through interviews and group discussions, in rare cases, according to a Native donor from Colorado, endowments have been supported, when “there is a mature organization that has both visibility and a sense of track record and an ability to implement their plan.”

Traditional Native communities also consider a more inherent conflict between current needs and unforeseen possibilities. In some communities, endowments are likened to “seed saving or conserving salmon for the winter to last for seven generations.” In more progressive terms, a tribal member likened an endowment to “an investment that produces dividends used for the development of new initiatives, special needs and large scale projects.” Another tribe in Wisconsin, arranged for their endowment funds to coincide with the end of their gaming compacts as a goal for long-term self sufficiency. In this case, their strategy derived from a sense of social obligation that combined investment planning with the long-term interests of the tribe.¹⁵⁵

Alaska Native Communities

Alaska Natives view endowments with mixed support. Because many of their communities are divided into separate regions, villages and corporations, each with varying degrees of stock or membership benefits, members of each community may view endowments with some resistance due to competing desires to respond to immediate needs, distribute as shareholder income or build for the future. Some Alaska Native regional corporations allocate funds for immediate concerns, others distribute through dividends and a small number elect to endow a fund. Those that would rather fund immediate needs may express views such as one foundation officer noted: “endowments are for individuals, not programs or communities; they are usually formed in academic institutions for narrow or personal purposes.” Such beliefs underscore some of the challenges to attracting corporate support for endowments. Those who have formed endowments are typically the wealthier, more stable communities, whose shareholders still receive dividends regardless of their contributions, and who also have reserves for more longer-term investments.

Tribal College Foundations

One of the fastest growing areas for endowment building in Native communities is in tribal colleges. In a recent *Tribal College Journal* article, the editor, Marjane Ambler, noted that some tribal colleges are establishing endowments as part of a matching grants program provided under Title III of the Higher Education Act and the Tribally Controlled Community College Act, administered by the federal government. According to Ambler, these matching grants have

been useful in stimulating support for tribal college endowments. Even with the match, however, Ambler notes that these endowments lack support from a critical mass of alumni and local businesses needed to sustain them. They also struggle to strike a balance between paying daily bills and raising money for permanent facilities.¹⁵⁶ With an average endowment of less than \$1 million and the largest well under \$10 million, many tribal colleges are forced to spend their endowment income on immediate and emergency needs.¹⁵⁷

Native Service Organizations

Native service organizations are building endowments from a variety of sources including non-Native sources and tribal contributions. Many lack staff skills and capital, which may be due, according to a Native community foundation officer from Minnesota, to the fact that

endowment building is a very long-term process, it depends on organizational capacity, maturity, community and board interest and gifts may be \$1 to \$1,000 in Native communities, but it takes larger gifts that depend on multigenerational wealth, and family experience to build and sustain an endowment.

For most Native organizations, endowment income is not generally used for operations; rather, it provides support for scholarships, programs and special needs in the community.

Native Donor Perceptions of Endowments

On the whole, Native donors (tribes and individuals) in this study reported that they had not been approached for endowment support from Native organizations or other Indian tribal foundations. They claimed that most Native organizations were still requesting program and operating support, and those who did seek endowment gifts were personally connected to the donor (Indian tribe) or to their advisors. Most donors were more likely to contribute to an endowment for a specific purpose, such as scholarships or a national cultural project, because it resulted in “safe support” with a more predictable and long-term impact. In a few instances, Native donors (individuals, tribes and organizations) contributed to endowed educational scholarship funds and cultural preservation projects (museums, community centers, etc.), but these gifts were relatively new and required a long and personal cultivation process. The donors viewed endowments as large gifts and lump sums, which tend to be rare in Indian country. Also, many Indian tribes were reluctant to plan for the future (e.g., charitable contributions), given the volatility of their wealth, and are forced to allocate annual funds based on profits and revenues. Individuals within these tribes were also not as inclined to consider the future because, as one Native donor put it, “nobody has wills; it is not a common practice.” In the rare case, where a donor formed an endowed fund, the donor did so, “for a sense of permanency and, to a lesser extent, for tax purposes.”

One Native donor suggested that, “to attain a level of accountability needed to attract endowment funds, there must be community ownership and participation.” Although Native donors make very few gifts to endowments, a northeastern gaming tribe contributed “a small percentage of a larger amount to an endowment and the remainder to construction efforts” of

a national Native cultural institution. Very few tribes or Native organizations, however, have or contribute to endowments.

“...to attain a level of accountability needed to attract endowment funds, there must be community ownership and participation.”—A Native donor

FUNDRAISING STRATEGIES AND MESSAGES IN NATIVE-AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

In the past, institutional philanthropy, as defined in Euro-American terms, was viewed in Indian country as a support system (government and private), rather than as an exchange. Gifts were raised through non-Native sources for redistribution to Native causes and projects. Within the Native community, fundraising and philanthropy were part of an informal, personal exchange, rather than a formal contractual arrangement. Phrases such as, “we use fundraising as a means of philanthropy to leverage greater dollars,” are not unusual. In Indian country, most institutional philanthropy consists either of money raised from non-Native sources (for redistribution) or from tribal enterprises. Beyond this, Native people have adopted many types of fundraising strategies suitable to their own communities. In Native communities, philanthropy is part of a continuum of giving and receiving, fundraising is the mainstream way of traversing that continuum.

Each Indian tribe has its own approach to raising the necessary funds for services and programs. Tribes assess their needs and implement strategies based on whether the sources of funding emanate from governmental, private or individual contributions. A relatively new phenomenon in indigenous fundraising—the results from success in gaming—is the entrance of other Indian tribes as possible funders. Native groups and communities historically have not requested support from other Indian tribes or individuals because of their belief that other tribes may have less or are caring for their own communities and are not positioned to fund others.

Most Effective Fundraising Messages in Native America

It is difficult for Native people, particularly those in traditional communities, to ask for support; they prefer to express their needs and allow others to respond. Therefore, the most effective fundraising messages in Native-American communities are those that:

- Convey respect for peoples’ dignity and cultural traditions;
 - Stress the importance of developing relationships with others;
 - Foster partnership opportunities;
 - Focus on empowerment in Native communities as opposed to continued dependence and inferiority; and
 - Respond to injustices toward and urgent needs of Native people.
-

In this study Native donors valued funds that:

- Affirm tribal cultures;
- Build self esteem, not dependence; and
- Allow Native people to control decisionmaking.

Most Effective Fundraising Strategies in Native America

Native-American organizations and Indian tribes have used many forms of fundraising techniques, including capital campaigns, annual giving, direct mail, workplace giving and solicitation of foundation and corporate grants. When raising funds from their own community, on an individual basis, requests tend to be: open ended, flexible, project oriented, personally approached and responsive to immediate or urgent situations.

Solicitation Methods

Although many Native organizations and Indian tribes use direct mail to raise funds, they usually use this technique for non-Native sources to attain a broader base of support. Direct mail is not as effective with Native donors, who tend to respond to more personal contact by telephone or at events. A Native community foundation grantmaker claimed that, “fundraising [in Indian country] is very event-based, product-oriented, like blanket dances at powwows, and feasts.” A member of a Minnesota tribe suggested that “event and workplace fundraising work best in Native communities” because they are more “communally oriented.” In Alaska Native communities, direct mail is not an effective strategy, according to an Alaska Native foundation officer, “because the community is shareholder-based and they view giving as part of the corporate responsibility” through distribution of dividends to tribal foundation activities. Annual and capital campaigns are gaining in popularity among the more established Native organizations, but much of their target audience is non-Native and, only recently, economically successful tribes. The more financially successful tribes are responding increasingly to mailed appeals from Native organizations, but their responses are usually prompted by personal contact or organizational name recognition.

Some Indian tribes and Native organizations expand their venues and opportunities by:

- Soliciting tribal vendors;
- Using earned income from educational and advocacy materials;
- Accessing the Internet for funding opportunities and posting their own Web sites;
- Raising money from tribal employees, their financial advisors and legal counsel, and companies that employ tribal members; and
- Establishing workplace giving programs such as Earth Share, Navajo Way, Change for a Dollar and others.

Indigenous fundraising also relies on the sale of products (arts and crafts); workplace giving programs through Native governmental programs like the Indian Health Service, Bureau of

Indian Affairs and other Native-focused agencies and programs; and the use of Native celebrities to help with outreach and recognition.

Whether the fundraising is through bake sales, bingos, raffles, memorials, auctions, musical performances or arts and crafts shows, the social and cultural relevance of the event is key to its success. Events generally succeed if they provide a forum for the community and individuals to address a cause or project and, according to a tribal foundation officer from Arizona, “events are a way of sharing oneself with the larger world.”

Increasingly, Indian tribes and Native organizations are using technology to access donors and solicit support. They are creating Web sites, linking to search engines and advertising on-line. Some organizations are developing products (sports gear, artwork, clothing) with their logo or name to sell to tribes and individuals for charitable purposes. In some tribal communities, fundraising is tied to a college building or student scholarships; it is highly targeted and oriented to immediate results. Many organizations use fundraising as a tool for further involvement in their activities. According to a Native service organization leader, they consider “membership dues, tribal contributions for projects, and individual solicitations” as ways to engage their community and validate their work.

Fundraising may also be part of a community activity. In Arizona, a tribal foundation officer pointed out the need to involve the community in all phases of development, including “proposals which are developed together with intended recipients, and lessons learned are shared among the community.” A leader of a Native service organization in Colorado suggested that, not only is fundraising community-based, but raising money from Indian tribes also involves a personal link whereby “they must know you and your work, know that the issues are very important and know the role the organization plays in Indian country; it is very personal, you must know how the tribe works, their priorities and procedures.” To reach donors in Native communities (i.e., Indian tribes), several respondents to this study claimed that one “must build a trust relationship, respect protocol, and understand decisionmaking systems that are often made by consensus and are not time bound.”

A common practice among Native communities (to their own members and others in the larger indigenous community) is not to ask for a specific amount or gift, but to inform the donor of the needs, and to allow the donor to determine the amount and type of gift, rather than requesting a specific dollar amount for a project.

Whether a project or program is tribally based or national in scope, most Native donors respond to:

- Ideas generated from the indigenous community;
- Long-term, intergenerational; and
- Crosscutting community revitalization efforts.

Native donors respond to specific types and styles of requests. For example, in a statewide United Way survey in California, most (about 60 percent) Native donors responded to requests for donations from personal contacts and special events. A majority were moved by a family

To reach donors in Native communities (i.e., Indian tribes), several respondents to this study claimed that one “must build a trust relationship, respect protocol, and understand decisionmaking systems that are often made by consensus and are not time bound.”

member or religious leader’s involvement in a project or cause. Almost half (45 percent) were influenced by television appeals or informational brochures, rather than direct mail requests.¹⁵⁸ By far the greatest motive for contributing was giving back to the community, while only a small percentage were driven by tax incentives. A key to giving was volunteer involvement—many Native donors had volunteered for organizations they supported.¹⁵⁹

Some fundraising appeals are based on the worst stereotypes of Indians, using pictures of poor children or images of helplessness. A Native fundraiser suggested that these impressions are usually drawn from a non-Native perspective, because most Native people seek to portray a “balance of integrity, and cultural accountability, with limited stereotyping, to attract dollars.” In Indian country, according to a leading Native fundraiser, raising money is synonymous with “brokering relationships and facilitating for causes and issues, and reconciling tribal values and protocols with those of the philanthropic community. It depends on a tribe’s or Native donor’s capacity to give, not on earmarking an amount for a project or need.”

Different Views of Fundraising

Similar to giving, differences in fundraising practices and terms exist among Native and non-Native communities. Where Euro-American fundraising emphasizes organization, information, causes, cases, campaigns, participation, legal obligations and ethics, Native communities refer to honor, sharing, ritualized reciprocity, community and responsibility toward future generations.¹⁶⁰ In addition, as a tribal foundation official from Oklahoma noted, tribes are conditioned to respond to the public sector, which is “service oriented,” and have difficulty with foundations, which are “process oriented.”

Some fundraising appeals are based on the worst stereotypes of Indians, using pictures of poor children or images of helplessness. A Native fundraiser suggested that these impressions are usually drawn from a non-Native perspective, because most Native people seek to portray a “balance of integrity, and cultural accountability, with limited stereotyping, to attract dollars.” In Indian country, according to a leading Native fundraiser, raising money is synonymous with “brokering relationships and facilitating for causes and issues, and reconciling tribal values and protocols with those of the philanthropic community. It depends on a tribe’s or Native donor’s capacity to give, not on earmarking an amount for a project or need.”

Challenges to Fundraising

Even though Native communities are becoming more active as fundraisers and grantmakers in the formal philanthropic arena, they still face many challenges in raising the funds necessary to sustain themselves for the future. Such challenges include:

- Mainstream grantmaking categories may not be relevant to Native communities because tribal programs are more integrated and holistic in their application.¹⁶¹
- Many foundations and corporations may be unfamiliar with the unique legal relationship between Indian tribes and the U.S. government. Foundations and corporations may not understand that Indian tribes are governments with sovereign powers. Finally, they may be unfamiliar with a 501(c)(3) corporation chartered under tribal law.¹⁶²
- Native and non-Native donors may not have the capacity (staff and material) to assist Indian tribes and organizations with the grantmaking process, as the government has done in the past (through technical assistance, joint programs, etc.).
- Most Indian tribes do not have knowledge of private funding sources or capacity (human or financial) to implement a highly competitive resource development campaign. They may be hindered by:
 - Decisionmaking that is different for Indian tribes than for nonprofits (i.e., coordination of activities between social units is through consensus, and if any group disagrees, it is not bound to participate and can withdraw its support). With each new tribal leader, policies and commitments of previous administrations may be ignored or discontinued;¹⁶³ and
 - Mainstream organizational fundraising is often part of marketing activities; Native communities, particularly Indian tribes, have had limited experience with and involvement in competitive marketing outside government application processes. Only recently have Indian tribes, mainly those with gaming, initiated public relations and marketing programs.¹⁶⁴

CONCLUSIONS

With each review of Native philanthropy,¹⁶⁵ new sources of support and types of funds emerge. Even in the past two years, the number of programs has risen from 32 to more than 50 (maybe more). Much of this is attributable to increasing economic success of some Indian tribes and a growing array of entrepreneurial ventures such as banks, intertribal programs and Native foundations.

This success has produced new wealth for a number of Native individuals and Indian tribes. Some have begun to use their wealth for charitable purposes, particularly in their own communities. Their members tend to be more cautious in an effort to protect their assets from public exposure and may be concentrating more on personal (financial and human) development and stability before investing (on a large scale) in charitable pursuits. Although it is too early to determine the impact of this new wealth on individual giving, real potential exists for enhanced

participation in philanthropy. Tribal members will likely be influenced by: their leadership; family involvement; volatility of success and tribal interests. It will take some time for most tribal members to allocate funds for future needs because many are only beginning to explore investment strategies, including charitable investments; a majority only recently developed savings accounts and retirement plans.

According to one Native foundation official, "Native people have the answers to the problems [we face], the right to conceptualize and actualize our futures, and funding should be designed to reflect this." "We are givers, not just takers." As donors, Native people, "need role models and success stories" and opportunities to participate in the philanthropic process "on our own terms, not others."

Native donors give, according to one Native foundation official, because "Native people have the answers to the problems [they face], the right to conceptualize and actualize their futures, and funding should be designed to reflect this."¹⁶⁶ They also see themselves "as givers, not just takers." As donors, Native people, "need role models and success stories" and opportunities to participate in the philanthropic process "on our own terms, not others." These sentiments are echoed throughout the Native community as more organizations, Indian tribes and Native individuals seek their independence and their place in the philanthropic arena.

Opportunities also exist in the larger Native community for increased giving as more individuals start their own businesses and advance educationally. Their giving will largely depend on their: civic and educational awareness, financial and investment advice, connection to philanthropic networks and level of success. It will take some time to cultivate these individuals as givers because they hold mainly first-generation wealth; most have not been exposed to institutional philanthropy as givers, are young and still in the throes of amassing their wealth.

The main growth areas in Native philanthropy are through the creation of nonprofit organizations and tribal enterprise. These two forms of giving are quite different from one another. Native nonprofit organizations are tribally or nationally based, community- or issue-oriented and structured and generally support cultural, educational or economic development activities. Tribal enterprise programs, on the other hand, are somewhat unstructured and commercially driven. They usually fund internal community projects (infrastructure and economic development) and external community relations activities. The likely convergence of the two may be through partnerships or collaborations with non-Natives to support the broader needs of Indian country.

Building endowments requires a long-term effort. For donors, particularly individuals, there is a perceived notion of reserves or permanent funds as elite or part "of the white man's world." In Indian country, most wealth is communal or tribal, and perhaps, formal structures or endowments may evolve from these roots.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Expanding Understanding of Native Philanthropic Lifeways

There is a need for more extensive research on the patterns, styles and motivations for giving, fundraising and endowment building in particular segments of the Native community. Such research might include:

- A broader and more focused quantitative examination of tribes with gaming enterprises, Alaska Natives and Native Hawai'ian charitable and volunteer activities;
- A concentrated study of giving among individual donors in Native communities and the impact of new wealth in some communities (reservation and nonreservation based);
- An examination of investment and financial strategies used by tribes and Native organizations for charitable purposes;
- An exploratory review of remittances to tribal kin, clan or organizations; and
- A concentrated review of the level and range of giving (in-kind, time and money) of Native people to Native and non-Native religious or spiritual activities and groups.

Great potential exists to stimulate giving among individuals, organizations and Indian tribes through tribal colleges, service and professional associations, intertribal networks and indigenous intermediary organizations. A multipronged approach of public awareness campaigns, education and training, exchanges and collaborative or partnership arrangements will help to enhance the perception among Native communities of institutional philanthropy as a public good. All of these approaches will require designs that respect diverse cultures and histories and have the flexibility to accept new styles, forms and models that do not threaten existing structures (tribal and familial) in each community.

Ways to Encourage Increased Native-American Philanthropy

- Educate Native business owners on the benefits of charitable giving. Support professional associations or intertribal networks, such as those of Native bankers, lawyers and engineers to provide this service.
 - Counter negative images that portray Indians as helpless and poor. Develop a series of articles highlighting the unique aspects of Native giving to engender a renewed spirit of self-worth and better understanding of the richness of the Native-American philanthropic culture. These articles might be targeted to local Native and non-Native media and could, for example, focus on a Native donor as a role model or community leader.
 - Work with tribal colleges to develop a curriculum on civic participation and philanthropy that respects Native traditions and history. Offer internships, mentoring programs and educational credit in this area.
 - Translate philanthropy into a language that is understandable to indigenous communities and include a program in schools, clubs, civic groups, community centers and other relevant venues.
-

- Elders are important conveyors of wisdom in Native communities. They serve as role models and spiritual guides. A meeting of elders from different tribes to discuss the role of more institutionalized giving could help to build support from within each community, possibly using the Montana Elders Circle or others as an organizing vehicle.
- Establish a surrogate speakers network of Native donors to serve as mentors, role models and advisors to solidify interest in giving among other potential Native donors.
- Recognize that one of the greatest sources of giving is through Indian tribes, particularly gaming enterprises. Foundations could convene meetings with staff and members of tribes with gaming enterprises to provide training and technical assistance on giving. These meetings could be coordinated by the National Indian Gaming Association, Native Americans in Philanthropy, the National Congress of American Indians, First Nations Development Institute or local intertribal networks. In addition, foundations might challenge tribes (gaming) to earmark a small percentage of their profits for charitable needs in Indian country by offering matching funds or investment-related loans.
- Create an on-line database of culturally relevant models and vehicles for giving appropriate for tribal communities.
- Promote all forms of giving including traditional methods through familial and kinship arrangements.
- Create a peer network of local and regional Native and non-Native donors.
- Provide a convenient meeting place to exchange ideas on giving, perhaps through intermediary organizations such as NAP, RAGs or indigenous professional associations because much of Native America is isolated in rural and remote areas. These groups might work with formal and informal leadership in Native communities to convey the broader leadership role they might play in philanthropy.
- Offer an executive and staff loan program run by foundations to help build trust, interest and expertise in grantmaking within the respective community because Native communities tend to learn best in familial or local settings. Listening, observing and doing are the most effective methods to learn in Native communities.
- Involve Native donors in the marketing and development plans of Native nonprofit organizations for endowment or annual fundraising campaigns.

Opportunities to Build Capacity of Native-American Nonprofits to Stimulate Giving

An increasing number of individuals in economically successful tribal communities are for the first time amassing wealth in many aspects of their life (financial, educational, material, etc.). Expressions of interest abound in participating in charitable and other civic activities. To allow for more fuller involvement in charitable giving, foundations and intermediary organizations such as Native Americans in Philanthropy, First Nations Development Institute, American Indian College Fund, Native American Rights Fund, Native bankers, lawyers and engineering organiza-

tions and others (intertribal networks) might sponsor training and technical assistance opportunities for these communities in investment, estate and financial planning as it relates to charitable activities.

Specific Opportunities

- Foundations might use challenge or matching grants to encourage the development of endowments in Indian country (smaller, long-term, institutional support).
- Partnerships and collaborations are effective means of stimulating philanthropy in Native communities. Tribes, like states, work best with other tribes, foundations and organizations as equal participants, not subordinates. To design a program of equal partners, Indian tribes and foundations together could provide funding for endowments in Indian country. Possible scenarios proposed by respondents in this study include:
 - Creation of an endowed foundation managed by a combination of elders and youth with technical guidance from experts. This approach would allow the elders to pass on their traditions and young people to learn more about giving. As one Native service organization leader from Colorado suggested, “Young people know the needs of the community and elders know how to meet those needs.”
 - Allocation of funds to organizations in the position to build endowments, to allow them to manage as endowments for a period of time (three to five years). As each organization completes its cycle, the principal is transferred to another Native organization for a similar period. Each organization would manage the principal (\$10 million to \$15 million), retain the interest and pass the principal to other Native organizations. At the end—15 years or so—the principal could be returned to the original source. This approach would enable a wider array of organizations to attain stability while learning investment and capacity building skills as well. Foundations and tribes could jointly contribute to this effort.
- Foundations might modify their evaluations to be more inclusive and respectful of different forms and lengths of measurements in Native communities, such as the qualitative impact of a grant (i.e., improvements to quality of life), and a longer-term outcome.
- Small planning grants might help to fund feasibility studies or other development and capacity-building needs to ascertain an organization’s readiness and potential for an endowment.
- Develop an on-line service to connect Native and non-Native donors to those in need in the Native community.
- Establish an exchange program with foundations to enable Indian tribes and Native organizations to access expertise. Invite Native people to advise foundations on projects. Develop an executive loan program with a resource bank of people who could serve as experts in different areas of grantmaking and solicitation. Provide internships at foundations to learn management and governance systems, visit various Native communities to

exchange ideas and share philanthropic philosophies, and sponsor outreach through RAGS or other intermediaries to connect Native communities with foundations.

- Develop long-term relationships between Native and non-Native philanthropic communities and nonprofits that might include multiyear grants, that are intergenerational, and cross-disciplinary. Joint programs between Native and non-Native communities might provide more decisionmaking opportunities on boards and advisory committees. Educate non-Native foundation boards about Native-American issues and cultures.
- Offer training programs to Native organizations on board, staff, fundraising and resource development (investment planning, financial management systems, planned giving, direct solicitations, legal options, volunteer management, public relations and marketing).
- Educate consulting firms (development and investment) and non-Native development officers on Native traditions and cultures. Inform advisors (financial planners, estate lawyers trusts officers, etc.) on the potential for philanthropy in and among Indian country.

In developing ways to implement these recommendations, it is critical to keep in mind the powerful reality that Native communities are diverse. Culture and history play a key role in their philanthropic endeavors. To stimulate more philanthropy, a program must be designed at the local level that respects tradition as well as the different styles and forms of giving. Any initiative must be structured to take into account these conditions.

ENDNOTES

1. Dean Chavers, *The Seminole Tribune*, Sept. 5, 1997.
 2. Ibid.
 3. For more information on Native philanthropy see, generally, Dagmar Thorpe, "A Native American's View of Philanthropy," *Foundation News & Commentary*, Jul./Aug. 1997, pp. 41-42; "Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes," *NSFRE Journal*, Autumn 1989, pp. 17-20; James A. Joseph, *Remaking America: How the Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures Are Transforming Our National Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1995 (hereafter "Remaking America"); and *NCAI Sentinel*, Summer 1998, p. 21. Indian country is so diverse that it is difficult to capture its complete demographics. In the United States, there are approximately 2.3 million American Indians and Alaska Natives, encompassing more than 200 languages, 32 of which have 10 or fewer speakers. These communities differ in lineage, location, size, histories, means of survival, religion and social and political systems. Some Indian tribes are linked by male relations, others by female. About 440,000 Indians live on reservations (out of 2.3 million), and of those, more than 50 percent live in poverty. A majority of American Indians live in urban and other rural areas, where almost a quarter live in poverty.
 4. See, generally, Alexander Ewen and Jeffrey Wollock, "Survey of Grantmaking by American Indian Foundations and Organizations," Lumberton, N.C.: Native Americans in Philanthropy, 1996 (hereafter "NAP Report").
-

-
5. Ibid.
 6. For more information on Native-American business activities, see the U.S. Census Bureau News Release, "Large Increase in the Number of Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaska Native Businesses between 1987 and 1992," Aug. 1, 1996, p. 1-3.
 7. See, generally, Jeff Wollock, "Protagonism Emergent: Indians and Higher Education," *Native Americas Journal*, Winter, 1997.
 8. Ibid.
 9. F. William Johnson, "Legalized Gambling: Economic Sovereignty for Native Americans," *Indian Gaming*, Dec., 1996, p. 16.
 10. Ibid.
 11. *The Sunday Oregonian Metro*, May 17, 1998, p. C1, 6.
 12. Ibid.
 13. Vine Deloria, Jr., "Survey of Conditions of Indians in the United States," San Francisco: prepared for the First People's Fund of the Tides Foundation, 1996, p. 6.
 14. See generally, Native American Rights Fund, *Justice Newsletter*, Fall 1998, p. 1. In 1887, Congress passed the Dawes Allotment Act in an effort to assimilate Indians into white society. Reservation lands were shifted from tribal ownership to "allotted" or parceled sections that were designated for individual tribal members for the purpose of farming or raising livestock. The allotment process proved disastrous for many tribes culturally, politically and economically. Private ownership conflicted with communal beliefs, eroded the role and sovereignty of tribal governments, and brought further poverty and loss of land to the tribes. By 1934, the federal government allotted more than 100 reservations, and tribes lost more than two-thirds of the land they held in 1887.
 15. See generally, Native American Rights Fund, *Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Report*, 1995, p. 7. In 1953, Congress passed a resolution to terminate the historical trust relationship between the U.S. government and Indian tribes. Federal funding for all existing service programs to tribes were to end and Indians were to be considered a disadvantaged minority group. Tribes were no longer to be recognized as governmental units. The termination policy was in effect until the mid-1960s.
 16. See generally, Sharon O'Brien, *American Indian Governments*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1989, p. 86. In 1956, Congress passed Public Law 959, which would use economic incentives to promote assimilation and urbanization in Indian country. It provided funds for institutional and on-the-job training for Indians. It did not, however, make these opportunities available on the reservations. Indians had to relocate to urban areas. Once they were living in the urban areas, Indians were no longer eligible for federal services. More than 35,000 individuals relocated to urban or off-reservation areas.
 17. See generally, James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
 18. Ibid.
-

19. For more information on early engagements of Native people and Europeans, see James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*; and Marjane Ambler, "The Long Tradition of Defying Selfishness," *Tribal College Journal*, VII: 3, Winter 1995-1996.
 20. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," in *Philanthropy in the World's Traditions*, Warren F. Ilchman, Stanley N. Katz and Edward L. Queen II, eds. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998.
 21. Ibid.
 22. Ibid.
 23. Ibid.
 24. James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
 25. Ibid.
 26. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," p. 34.
 27. Jack Weatherford, *Native Roots: How the Indians Enriched America*. New York City: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1991; and *Indian Givers: How the Indians of the Americas Transformed the World*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1988.
 28. Ibid.
 29. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," p. 32.
 30. See generally, James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
 31. Ibid.
 32. See generally, Kathleen M. Nilles, Douglas B. L. Endreson, Amy Locklear and Jeffrey A. Trexler. *Giving With Honor: A Legal Reference on Charitable Activities of American Indian Tribes*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations, 1998.
 33. Ibid; Tribal governments deliver a broad range of health, education, social welfare and economic services to reservation residents and businesses.
 34. James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
 35. See Native American Rights Fund, *Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Newsletter*, 1995. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) of 1971 extinguished all aboriginal title to nine-tenths of the lands in Alaska as well as all aboriginal fishing, hunting and water rights in return for 44 million acres and almost \$1 billion. As part of the settlement, each Alaska Native alive on Dec. 17, 1971, received stock in their regional corporation.
 36. For more information on Alaska Native regional corporations, see Kathleen M. Nilles, Douglas B.L. Endreson, Amy Locklear and Jeffrey Trexler, *Giving With Honor: A Legal Reference on Charitable Activities of American Indian Tribes*, Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations, 1998, pp. 13-14; *Native Americas*, Fall 1995, p. 3; and Alaska Native Knowledge Network, Anchorage, Alaska. Alaska Native tribes account for 226 of the more than 500 federally recognized Indian tribes in the United States. Approximately one-third of the Indian tribes in Alaska, or about 72, are organized under the Indian Reorganization Act, others are governed by traditional village councils. For many of these tribes, some or all of
-

their programs are administered through 16 intertribal consortia, most of which are recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as tax exempt, charitable nonprofit corporations chartered under state law. These consortia receive funding from state and federal governments, as well as private foundations and other public sources. The bulk of the funding stems from contracting or compacting activities under the Indian Self Determination Act. More than 85,000 Native Americans reside in Alaska where 80 percent of the villages are inaccessible by roads.

37. James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
38. Ibid.
39. The 1987 case was originally challenged in the 1979 case, *Seminole Tribe vs. Butterworth*.
40. See generally, Marguerite Carroll, "Cashing in on Gaming Revenue," *American Indian Report*, Aug. 1997. IGRA requires: 1) gaming by Indian tribes to serve as a means of promoting economic development, self-sufficiency and strong tribal governments; 2) regulation of gaming by an Indian tribe to shield it from organized crime and other corrupting influences; and 3) the establishment of federal standards for gaming on Indian lands, and the establishment of a National Indian Gaming Commission to meet congressional concerns regarding gaming and to protect such gaming as a means of generating tribal revenues.
41. Ibid.
42. Matt Conor, "One Good Turn," *International Gaming and Wagering Business*, Aug. 1998, pp. 12-18.
43. James Dao, "Gambling in the Middle of Nowhere," *The New York Times*, Nov. 11, 1997.
44. Jonathan Rabinowitz, "A Tribes Casino Profits Invested in Indian Film," *The New York Times*, Sept. 5, 1997; and "The United States, 1997," *International Wagering and Business*, Aug. 1998, pp. 24-27.
45. Ibid.
46. See generally, "Indian Gaming: An Inside Look," *Harrab's People*, 41:1, 1995, pp. 4-11; and NIGC public information, 1999. Under IGRA, there are three classes of Indian gaming: Class I is traditional gaming played as part of ceremonies or celebrations; Class II are games such as bingo, poker, nonhouse banked games; and Class III, are all forms of gaming including slot machines and other table games such as Black Jack.
47. See generally, National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) public information, 1999.
48. See generally, "The United States 1997," *International Gaming & Wagering Business*, Aug. 1998, pp. 23-27. As of February 1998, 148 tribes in 24 states entered into 172 Class III compacts, with more than 287 tribal gaming facilities. Most of the successful facilities are part of small tribes located near urban centers.
49. See generally, James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
50. See generally, *NAP Report*.
51. See generally, National Indian Gaming Association (NIGA) public information, 1997.

52. Information provided by NIGC.
 53. See generally, Deloitte & Touche, "A Historical Review of Gaming in the United States, Revenue Analysis by Gaming Segment," 1997.
 54. Ibid.
 55. Sebastian Sinclair, "Robust Replacement Market," *International Gaming & Wagering Business*, Aug. 1998, p. 8.
 56. Peter Kilborn, "For Poorest Indians, Casinos Aren't Enough," *The New York Times*, June 11, 1997, p. A1.
 57. James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*.
 58. *News from Indian Country*, late Mar. 1996.
 59. See generally, "The United States 1997," *International Gaming & Wagering Business*, Aug. 1998, pp. 23-27. Approximately 42 of California's 106 federally recognized Indian tribes operate casinos with 15,000 uncompact machines that earn between \$600 million and \$750 million a year. In early 1998, Governor Pete Wilson tried to create a model compact with the Pala Band of Mission Indians. The Vieja, Sycuan and Barona Tribes expressed support for the compact, other tribes condemned it. In June 1998, Indian tribes won their legal battle in a ruling against the governor, and in November, a special referendum was passed that allows tribes to continue their right to gaming. Tribes in Arizona, Florida, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington and other states have experienced threats as well.
 60. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," p. 36.
 61. See generally, Francie Ostrower, *Why the Wealthy Give*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
 62. See generally, Ronald A. Wells. *The Honor of Giving: Philanthropy in Native America*. Indianapolis: Center on Philanthropy, 1998.
 63. Mary Ann Zehr, "Looking Deeper into Indian Country," *Foundation News and Commentary*, Sept./Oct. 1993, p. 15).
 64. Ibid.
 65. Ibid.
 66. Many of these terms were drawn from the cover of *Tribal College Journal*, VII:3, Winter 1995-1996.
 67. This term was contributed by an elder of the Oneida Tribe of Wisconsin.
 68. The term was contributed by an official of the College of the Menominee Nation.
 69. This term was contributed by an official of the Doyon Foundation.
 70. The term was drawn from the *Pequot Times*, June 1998.
 71. This term was contributed by an official of the Pueblo of Laguna Tribe.
 72. This term was provided by a member of the Yupik Eskimos.
 73. See generally, Marjane Ambler, *Tribal College Journal*, VII:3, Winter 1994-1996.
-

-
74. Ibid.
 75. Ibid.
 76. According to a Native nonprofit leader from Colorado, the seventh generation is approximately 150 years.
 77. Ibid.
 78. See generally, Lydia Whirlwind Soldier, "Wancantognaka: The Continuing Lakota Custom of Generosity," *Tribal College Journal*, VII: 3, Winter 1995-1996.
 79. Ibid.
 80. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," p. 30.
 81. See Tracy Becker, "Reflections on Traditional American Indian Ways," American Indian Research and Policy Institute, Fall 1998, p. 12.
 82. *Business Alert, Special Double Issue 1997-1998*, Fredericksburg, VA: First Nations Development Institute, 1998, p. 3.
 83. See generally, Dagmar Thorpe, "Renewing the Universe: How Philanthropy Can Support Native Lifeways," developed by the Lifeway Project and commissioned by the First Peoples Fund of the Tides Foundation, San Francisco, CA, 1997; and *People of the Seventh Fire: Returning Lifeways of Native America*, Akwe: Kon Press, 1996.
 84. Ibid.
 85. See generally, Marjane Ambler, "Prestige and Wealth in Traditional Blood Society," *Tribal College Journal*, VII:3, Winter 1995-1996.
 86. See generally, Ronald A. Wells, *The Honor of Giving: Philanthropy in Native America*. Indianapolis: Center on Philanthropy, 1998.
 87. Ibid.
 88. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," p. 27.
 89. See generally, Ronald A. Wells, *The Honor of Giving: Philanthropy in Native America*.
 90. See generally, Jimm Good Tracks, "Native American Noninterference," in *Differential Diagnosis and Treatment in Social Work*, 2nd Edition, Francis J. Turner, ed., Free Press (1973) pp. 496-502.
 91. Ibid.
 92. See Tracy Becker, "Reflections on Traditional American Indian Ways," American Indian Research and Policy Institute, Fall 1998, p. 5; and Dagmar Thorpe, "A Native American's View of Philanthropy." European Americans usually learn from written formats that emphasize linear logical thinking; Native languages are often taught through stories and oral formats. Many languages are only spoken, not written, and they are passed from one generation to the next through images and living oral traditions.
 93. See generally, Debra Blum and Stephen Greene, "American Demographics: Finding Wealthy Donors," *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, Aug. 13, 1998.
-

94. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy."
 95. Most giving is informal through family, clan, kinship and tribal activities as well as intertribal and pan-Indian networks.
 96. See generally, Kathleen M. Nilles, Douglas B. L. Endreson, Amy Locklear and Jeffrey A. Trexler. *Giving With Honor: A Legal Reference on Charitable Activities of American Indian Tribes*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations, 1998.

"As background, Indian tribes, like states, use revenue generated by tribal enterprises to meet their governmental responsibilities. Indian tribes are treated under the Indian Tribal Governmental Tax Status Act (IRC § 7871) like states for most federal tax matters. IRC § 7871 provides a number of tax benefits to Indian tribes such as exemption from various excise taxes and tax exempt bonding authority. In general, only federally recognized tribes are eligible for § 7871 treatment."

"Federally recognized tribes are governments, and as such, they are immune from federal income taxes. Donations to tribal governments are eligible for the charitable contribution deduction, the gift deduction and the charitable estate deduction."
 97. Ibid.
 98. See generally, *Indian Gaming Report*, 1998. Indian tribal gaming is a form of government enterprise (as opposed to private enterprise). IGRA requires that Indian tribes use gaming profits in ways that improve the tribe's welfare. These investments include educational and other community programs.
 99. See generally, *NAP Report*.
 100. See generally, "We the First Americans," Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Sept. 1993.
 101. See, generally, *NAP Report*.
 102. John A. Grim, "A Comparative Study in Native American Philanthropy," p. 26.
 103. Ibid., p. 38.
 104. Ibid., p. 49.
 105. Tracy Becker, "Reflections on Traditional American Indian Ways," American Indian Research and Policy Institute, Fall 1998.
 106. James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*, p. 36.
 107. See generally, Dagmar Thorpe, "A Native American's View of Philanthropy."
 108. See generally, Rebecca Adamson, "Money with a Mission: A History of Indian Philanthropy," *Tribal College Journal*, Winter, 1994, pp. 26-29, 46.
 109. See generally, "Indian Gaming: An Inside Look," *Harrah's People* 41:1, Winter 1995, pp. 4-11; and "Myths and Facts," *National Indian Gaming Association*, 1998. Because Indian tribes are sovereign nations, they maintain rights and authority over their designated land and people. Tribal members who live and work on the reservation are not subject to state income taxation, but do pay federal income, FICA and social security taxes.
-

-
110. *Indian Giver*, First Nations Development Institute, Fall/Winter 1997-1998, p. 9.
 111. Mary Ann Zehr, "Look Deeper into Indian Country," *Foundation News and Commentary*, Sept./Oct. 1993, p. 15.
 112. See Paul G. Schervish, "Inclination, Obligation and Association: What We Know and What We Need to Learn About Donor Motivation," in Dwight F. Burlingame, ed. *Critical Issues in Fundraising*. New York City: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997, pp. 110-138.
 113. See previous discussion of IRC § 7871 in footnote 96.
 114. *Zuni Tribal Newspaper*, 1997.
 115. Information was drawn from the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians press release dated Mar. 1998.
 116. Ibid.
 117. Ibid.
 118. For more information, see *American Indian Report*, Mar. 1998, p. 17. More than 25,000 students from 250 federally recognized Indian tribes are enrolled in tribal colleges.
 119. See generally, Marjane Ambler, "Endowments: Investing in the Future," *Tribal College Journal*, II:3, Winter 1995-96.
 120. Shannon Finley, "Indian Gaming Hardly a Panacea," Denver: *American Indian College Fund*, 1995.
 121. The tribal colleges with foundations include: Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College, Northwest Indian College, Sinte Gleska University, Institute of American Indian Arts, Cankdeska Cikana Community College, Oglala Lakota College, Dull Knife Memorial College, Salish Koatenai College and Haskell Indian Nations University.
 122. See generally, Marjane Ambler, "Endowments: Investing in the Future."
 123. According to a survey by Diana Newman, a consultant to the Council on Foundations, the following community foundations have Native controlled or initiated funds: The Arizona Community Foundation, the Community Foundation of Greater Memphis, the Community Foundation for Palm Beach and Martin Counties, the Dayton Foundation, the Duluth-Superior Area Community Foundation, the Hawai'i Community Foundation, the Humboldt Area Foundation, Montana Community Foundation, the North Carolina Community Foundation, Oklahoma City Community Foundation, the Oregon Community Foundation, the Petoskey-Harbor Springs Area Community Foundation, the St. Paul Foundation, the Santa Fe Community Foundation, the South Dakota Community Foundation and the Triangle Community Foundation.
 124. Information was drawn from a speech by Tony Genia—a board member of the Two Feathers Fund of the St. Paul Foundations—at the Community Foundations Meeting, Council on Foundations, Oct. 11, 1998.
 125. Information was drawn from the Anishinabe Fund Guidelines of the Duluth-Superior Area Community Foundation.
-

126. According to a tribal fund official, this tribe plays a key role in the formulation of local philanthropy; the tribe meets in their casino to make grantmaking decisions for their endowment funds, offers in-kind donations to the endowment, and plans a casino fundraiser for the unrestricted grantmaking endowment. The tribe appealed to its members to give away part of their per capita allotment, but it is too early to evaluate the benefits of that appeal because many tribal members only recently assumed their wealth and may be reluctant to give it away before providing for their own needs.
 127. Information was drawn from a speech by Elizabeth Fentress of the North Carolina Community Foundation at the Community Foundations meeting, Council on Foundations, Oct. 11, 1998.
 128. See *News from Indian Country*, Mar. 1998.
 129. See generally, *United Way Multi-Ethnic Research Project Report*, Jan. 1996.
 130. See discussion of Alaska Native regional corporations in footnote 36.
 131. Mary Ann Zehr, "Look Deeper into Indian Country," *Foundation News and Commentary*, Sept./Oct. 1993, p. 15.
 132. See generally, *NAP Report*.
 133. See, generally, *NAP Report*; and *Native Americans*, XII:3, Fall 1995, p. 3.
 134. See previous explanation of tribal enterprise activities in footnote 96.
 135. Indian tribes are not subject to laws restricting the separation of political and charitable activities. All contributions are lumped together for purposes of tribal records.
 136. See generally, *Giving USA Update*, Issue 2, 1998.
 137. Melissa Gedachian, "Oneida Nation: Keeping an Eye on the Sparrow," *Indian Gaming*, Feb. 1996, pp. 2-4, 28.
 138. Dennis McAuliffe, "Casinos Deal Indians A Winning Hand," *The Washington Post*, Mar. 5, 1996, p. A1.
 139. Ibid.
 140. Nelson I. Rose, "California Tribes Flex Political Muscles," *Indian Gaming*, Feb./Mar. 1998, p. 31.
 141. *Indian Giver*, Fall/Winter 1997-1998, p.18; and *Indian Country Today*, June 1-8, 1998.
 142. *Indian Gaming*, Feb./Mar. 1998, p. 56.
 143. Ibid.
 144. *Indian Country Today*, June 1-8, and Feb. 9-26, 1998; *NCAI Sentinel*, Summer 1998, p. 3.
 145. "Indian Gaming: An Inside Look," *Harrah's People*, 41:1, Winter 1995, pp. 4-11.
 146. Information supplied by Symington Public Relations, Inc., San Diego, CA, 1999.
 147. See generally, *Indian Country Today*, Dec. 1-8, 1997.
 148. See generally, *Southwest Tribune*, Jan. 27-Feb. 3, 1997.
-

-
149. *Indian Gaming*, Feb./Mar. 1998, pp. 38, 53.
150. See generally, *NAP Report*.
151. Information was drawn from the Michigan Native-American Foundation materials.
152. Each regional corporation has a board, president and shareholders. Shareholders are enrolled members of the tribe who receive dividends and/or benefits from corporate profits. They vote for corporate officers and approve policies and investments.
153. See earlier discussion of ANCSA, in footnote 35.
154. According to an Alaska Native foundation official, more than 50 percent of Alaska Native regional corporations have foundations (private or public), some are endowed and others are supported by annual contributions. Of the few prosperous tribes with timber, fishing, oil and mineral wealth, most, like Doyon, CIRI, Sealaska and others, are strong enough to sustain their giving through economic boom-and-bust cycles. However, most tribes struggle to provide the minimum for their members, and may not be able to create, implement and maintain a foundation.
155. Tim Johnson, "The Dealer's Edge," *Native Americas*, XII:1-2, Summer 1995, pp. 16-24.
156. See generally, Marjane Ambler, "Endowments: Investing in the Future," *Tribal College Journal*, II:3, Winter 1995-96.
157. Ibid.
158. See generally, *United Way Multi-Ethnic Research Project Report*, Jan. 1996.
159. Ibid.
160. See generally, Dagmar Thorpe, "A Native American's View of Philanthropy."
161. See generally, Mary Ann Zehr, "Look Deeper into Indian Country," *Foundation News*, Sept./Oct. 1993, p. 14. Also, according to the conference proceedings of a meeting in Polson, MT, in 1994, foundations often use funding approaches that do not mirror the needs of Indian Country, such as seed money, special projects and short-term grants.
162. See generally, the Kathleen M. Nilles memo to the Council on Foundations, which detailed First Nations Development Institute's inquiry on tribal tax issues, dated Oct. 18, 1998. Two IRS letters have clarified the IRS' understanding of nonprofit tax law as it applies to 501(c)(3) corporations chartered under tribal law. On Sept. 8, the IRS clarified that a corporation chartered under tribal law can be recognized as a 501(c)(3) organization. The IRS clarified that private foundations grants to tribal governments are qualifying distributions and not taxable expenditures under the rules that apply to private foundations.
163. See generally, Dagmar Thorpe, "Looking at Philanthropy through Native American Eyes;" and Rebecca Adamson, "Creating a New Vision for Native American Philanthropy," *Responsive Philanthropy*, Summer 1996, pp. 9-10.
164. Ibid.
165. See generally, *NAP Report*.
166. See Dagmar Thorpe, *Renewing the Universe*.
-

METHODOLOGY AND INFORMATION SOURCES*

This study included interviews with 48 Native-American individuals and representatives of service organizations as well as Indian tribes who contributed time, money, goods and intellectual capital to charitable causes, programs and projects. Interviews, which were conducted by telephone, personal visit and questionnaire, reached donors from 16 Indian tribes, three Alaska Native foundations, two intertribal consortia and an assortment of academics, advisors (financial and political), national and local Native and non-Native foundation and service organization leaders as well as nonreservation-based Native donors. The study was augmented by information gleaned from two meetings, a focus group of 12 Native nonprofit grantmakers and grantseekers and a dinner gathering of more than 100 members of a gaming tribe that focused on the importance of individual philanthropy in their community.

Identification and recruitment of donors for this study involved a process of networking and relationship-building with more than 100 individuals who work in or with Native-American communities as fundraisers, advisors, grantmakers, academics and nonprofit leaders. Beginning with suggestions from Native Americans in Philanthropy, a Council on Foundations affinity group, sources were suggested as both informants and potential interviewees—donors, advisors, service organizations, intermediaries, etc. Additionally, through a scan of the literature, more than 105 citations were collected and analyzed, and 36 were abstracted and incorporated into the analysis. Many sources—individuals, Indian tribes and organizations—were used as a basis for further contacts. In addition, several Native-American news services were consulted for background information.

Although the sample used for this report is small relative to the diverse Native population,** an attempt was made to select donors based on geography, charitable fund structure, involvement in public charities or with private foundations or personal giving, role in Native-American leadership organizations and general experience and knowledge of the field of philanthropy. Interviewees were also drawn from: conferences (e.g., Council on Foundations, Independent Sector, National Congress of American Indians, National Indian Gaming Association, Association of Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Associations (ARNOVA)); workshops (e.g., First Nations Development Institute and Native Americans in Philanthropy); focus groups; and personal contacts in Native service organizations and Native and non-Native foundations.

* Herein, Native Americans includes American Indians residing in the 48 contiguous states, and Alaska Natives. This report does not include coverage of Native Hawai'ians.

** See generally, James A. Joseph, *Remaking America*. Although American Indians comprise only slightly more than 1 percent of the total population, when a second category, Americans of Indian descent is included, the Native population swells to 7 million, which helps to place Native peoples in a larger context.

Of the 33 donors and 15 advisors, scholars and nonprofit fundraisers:

- Thirty-two were females and 16 were male;
- Approximately half were over the age of 50; and
- Seventeen came from the West—California, Colorado, Kansas, Montana and Oklahoma; three came from the South and Southeast—Georgia and North Carolina; seven came from the northeast—Connecticut, District of Columbia, New York and Virginia; four came from the northwest—Alaska and Oregon; ten came from the midwest—Minnesota, Michigan and Wisconsin; and seven came from the southwest—Arizona and New Mexico.

This breakdown is somewhat representative of Indian country, where a majority of Indian tribes are concentrated in a few states, situated in rural areas, mostly west of the Mississippi River—two of every three American Indians live in the 10 states with the largest Native populations, (i.e., Alaska, Arizona, California, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas and Washington).*** A further stratification of Indian country, according to one Native donor from Colorado, might divide Indian country into “three subsets—poor communities with a tremendous range of social needs, very little infrastructure or ability to execute programs; mid-range communities where there are some natural resources, a lot of government funding, and organizations that are similar to the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and wealthy tribes with gaming enterprises who are highly leveraged and operate like corporations.” It is difficult to account for the potential of Native philanthropy, particularly if donors do not identify as Native. In this sense, this sample may not be representative of the broader number of Natives with mixed heritage or ancestral roots, because those interviewed self-identified as Native Americans.

Of the 33 donors, their annual giving, through the tribe, individual or organization, ranged from \$1,000 to \$1,000,000 (with one multiyear contribution of \$10 million). Most of the larger gifts were tribally donated, the mid-range contributions generally came from organizations and smaller and more frequent denominations came from individuals. Much of this pattern is attributable to the communal nature of Indian country and its organizational or tribally centered wealth. The individuals represented in this study were all from first-generation wealth, derived their fortunes from entrepreneurial ventures (resorts, arts, finance) or tribal enterprise (gaming), and generally gave between \$25,000 to \$100,000 annually.

The Underlying Questions

This work was guided by a series of exploratory questions, largely informed by the Council on Foundations and its three project funders and prior research in the following areas:

- What are the giving preferences, motivations and interests of Native-American donors?

*** See generally, “We the First Americans,” *Bureau of the Census Report*, Washington, D.C., U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Sept. 1993.

- What is the current attitude toward, and status of, endowment-building among Native donors of Native endowed funds?
- Which organizational approaches—tribal, private, family or independent foundation; federated, United Ways or community foundations funds; tribal enterprise; etc.—are most favored by Native donors as vehicles to develop and control their charitable assets?
- What fundraising strategies and messages are most effective in (and unique to) the Native community?

These questions guided the interviews and helped to frame the content and focus of this report.

ORGANIZATIONS AND TRIBES CONTRIBUTING TO THIS PROJECT

The Emerging Funds of Communities of Color Project, administered by the Council on Foundations and funded the by Ford, W. K. Kellogg and David and Lucile Packard foundations, was led by Joanne Scanlan, senior vice president, and staffed by Bettye Brentley and Donna Ortega as well as a team of consultants that included Mindy Berry, Jessica Chao, Diana Newman, Henry A. J. Ramos and Mary-Frances Winters.

More than 100 sources were consulted, interviewed, or drawn from literature for this study. Although they are not mentioned by name, their organizational, informational and personal insights greatly enriched the substance, breadth and depth of this report. Some individual donors, who are not tribally based and are not affiliated with an institutional giving program, are not listed below out of respect for the confidentiality of their comments. They are acknowledged anonymously throughout the report to recognize their deeply personal experiences in and contributions to the charitable arena.

The following Indian tribes and Native organizations contributed their time and wisdom and helped to identify other donors, literature and other valuable information on Native-American philanthropy:

Alaska Federation of Natives
Anchorage, Alaska

American Indian Law Alliance
New York, New York

Alaska Native Knowledge Network
Fairbanks, Alaska

American Indian Research and Policy Institute
St. Paul, Minnesota

American Indian College Fund
Denver, Colorado

American Indian Resources Institute
Oakland, California

American Indian Higher Education Consortium
Alexandria, Virginia

American Indian Science and Engineering Society
Denver, Colorado

Americans for Indian Opportunity
Bernalillo, New Mexico

Ancient Ways of Knowing Foundation
Colorado Springs, Colorado

ATLATL
Phoenix, Arizona

Barona Band of Indians
San Diego, California

Blackfeet Tribal Nation
Browning, Montana

Bristol Bay Native Association
Bristol Bay Region, Alaska

Bureau of Indian Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Cherokee Tribal Nation of Oklahoma
Tahlequah, Oklahoma

Chickasaw Nation
Ada, Oklahoma

College of the Menominee Nation
Keshena, Wisconsin

Cook Inlet Region Foundation, Inc.
Anchorage, Alaska

Cornell University
Native Americas Journal
Ithaca, New York

Council of Energy Resource Tribes
Denver, Colorado

Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe
of Indians
Roseburg, Oregon

Doyon Foundation
Fairbanks, Alaska

Duluth-Superior Area Community
Foundation
Duluth, Minnesota

Eastern Band of the Cherokee Nation
Cherokee, North Carolina

Financial Concepts, Inc.
Santa Fe, New Mexico

First Nations Development Institute
Fredericksburg, Virginia

Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior
Chippewa
Cloquet, Minnesota

Four Times Foundation
Red Lodge, Montana

Fund for the Four Directions
New York, New York

Gardner, Carton & Douglas
Washington, D.C.

Haskell Foundation
Lawrence, Kansas

Hopi Foundation
Hotevilla, Arizona

Indiana University, Center on
Philanthropy
Indianapolis, Indiana

Intertribal Council of Arizona, Inc. Phoenix, Arizona	Native California Network King City, California
Intertribal Council of Oklahoma Miami, Oklahoma	National Indian Gaming Association Washington, D.C.
Kaw Tribe Kaw City, Oklahoma	Navajo Way Window Rock, Arizona
Laguna Education Foundation Pueblo of Laguna, New Mexico	North Carolina Community Foundation Raleigh, North Carolina
Lannan Foundation Santa Fe, New Mexico	Northwest Area Foundation St. Paul, Minnesota
Loyola University Chicago, Illinois	Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin Oneida, Wisconsin
Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation Mashantucket, Connecticut	Rosa Minoka Hill Fund Denver, Colorado
Michigan Native American Foundation Sault Saint Marie, Michigan	St. Paul Foundation St. Paul, Minnesota
Montana Community Foundation Helena, Montana	St. Paul Companies St. Paul, Minnesota
National Congress of American Indians Washington, D.C.	Santa Fe Community Foundation Santa Fe, New Mexico
National Museum of the American Indian Washington, D.C.	Sealaska Heritage Foundation Juneau, Alaska
Native American Financial Advisors, Inc. Atlanta, Georgia	Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development Arcata, California
Native American Rights Fund Boulder, Colorado	Solidarity Foundation New York, New York
Native Americans in Philanthropy Lumberton, North Carolina	Sonosky, Chambers, Sachse & Endreson Washington, D.C.

Sycuan Band of Indians
San Diego, California

University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Thakiwa Foundation
Stroud, Oklahoma

University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Tides Foundation
San Francisco, California

Viejas Band of Indians
San Diego, California

Tribal College Journal
Mancos, Colorado

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals helped identify, interpret and analyze the wide range of information incorporated into this report. A few individuals, however, served as constant reminders of the complexities inherent in Native-American philanthropy. Without the sage and steady counsel of the following individuals, this report would be incomplete: Marjane Ambler, Rebecca Adamson, Sherry Salway Black, Donna Chavis, Lucille Echohawk, LaDonna and Laura Harris, Barbara Hartwell, Ron McKinley, Patrick Murphy, Barbara Poley, John Poupart, Floyd Solomon, Joanne Stately, Dick Trudell, Ingrid Washinawatok and Miranda Wright. It has been a particular privilege to have worked so closely with Ingrid Washinawatok, O' Pektaw-Metamoh (Flying Eagle Women), whose passing into the "Spirit World" draws renewed importance to this work. Her spirit will guide it on a path to greater heights for Native people and philanthropy.

Several organizations also provided assistance integral to this report. Through focus group meetings, panel sessions and workshops, Native Americans in Philanthropy and First Nations Development Institute provided invaluable insight and knowledge helping to bring new audiences and perspectives into the analysis.

In addition, I would like to thank every individual, organization and Indian tribe that gave of their time and wisdom unselfishly for this project. Without their ideas, creativity and vision, this report would not have been possible.

It is also incumbent upon me to note that notwithstanding the significant individual, organizational and tribal contributions to this report, responsibility for its content, and any inaccuracies or omissions that may be contained herein, are mine alone.

Mindy L. Berry
June 1999
